

AD-A056 848

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION ALEXANDRIA VA
ANALYSIS OF TRAINING MANAGEMENT SURVEY.(U)

F/G 5/9

OCT 71 T O JACOBS, J A SALTER, C I CHRISTIE
HUMRRO-CR-D4-71-33

DAHC19-70-C-0012

UNCLASSIFIED

NL

1 OF
ADA
056848

2



TAS
DIV. 4
OCT. 71

E6130

umRRO

①

[REDACTED]

SC



DDC
RECEIVED
JUL 81 1981
REGISTRY
B

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) is a nonprofit corporation established in 1969 to conduct research in the field of training and education. It was established as a continuation of The George Washington University's Human Resources Research Office. HumRRO's general purpose is to improve human performance, particularly in organizational settings, through behavioral and social science research, development, and consultation.

Human Resources Research Organization
200 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

AD A 056848

AD No. _____
DDC FILE COPY

16

29062107A712

9

Consulting Report.

6

ANALYSIS OF TRAINING MANAGEMENT SURVEY.

10

T. O./Jacobs, J. A./Salter, I./Christie,
E. W./Spinaio

11

October 20 1971

14

HumRRO-CR-D4-71-33

12

86-p.

15

DAHCI9-70-C-0012

This Consulting Report has been prepared to provide information to the requesting agency on the results of technical advisory service. It has been issued by the Director of HumRRO Division No. 4. It has not been reviewed by, nor does it necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the President, Human Resources Research Organization, or the Department of the Army.

HumRRO Division No. 4
Fort Benning, Georgia

DDC
RECEIVED
JUL 31 1978
B

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

78 07 21 121

405260

actH

FOREWORD

A Board for Dynamic Training was formed at Fort Benning, Georgia, in early September, at the direction of the Chief of Staff of the Army. The Board is chaired by Brigadier General P. E. Gorman, Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Army Infantry School.

HumRRO was asked by the Board to assist in the development and analysis of a survey, to be administered to experienced officers and enlisted men, to identify the major problems now serving as barriers to the development of innovative, challenging, and stimulating unit training, Army-wide. This Consulting Report is a report of that survey.

This Technical Advisory Service was conducted at HumRRO Division No. 4, Fort Benning, Georgia, under the supervision of Dr. T. O. Jacobs, Director. LTC Chester I. Christie is the Chief of the U.S. Army Infantry Human Research Unit.

HumRRO research for the Department of the Army is conducted under Contract DAHC 19-70-C-0012. Training, Motivation, and Leadership research is conducted under Army Project 2Q062107A712.

ACCESSION for		
NTIS	WHLA Section	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DRC	WHLA Section	<input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED		<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION		
BY		
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES		
Dist.	AVAIL.	and/or SPECIAL
A		

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It will be clear to anyone who examines the Appendix that the present report does not elaborate all the data actually contained in the survey results. An attempt has been made to restrict the discussion to those findings of greatest salience, from the point of view of identifying the problem (to the extent the problem can be identified in a survey instrument), and factors that bear on the problem. To the extent that overall conclusions can be drawn from the data collected in this survey and discussed in this report, they probably would be:

(a) Overall, there is substantial confidence at all rank levels in the motivation and quality of small unit commanders and leaders. This suggests that there would be no universal support for the proposition that these leaders and commanders are basically lacking in ability. There is a feeling at the lower levels that their training for conducting small unit training has not been as adequate as it might have been.

(b) There are substantial indications in the survey results that seniors and subordinates do not see eye-to-eye on many key points and expectations, many of which have to do with the present quality of small unit training, the possibility of improvement, and the way in which improvement might be effected. As an example, Table A shows responses to a question as to whether respondents would characterize training in their units as dynamic, as the term was used in the survey instrument. There was a substantial tendency for personnel at the lower grade levels to believe

that their units' training was less frequently "dynamic" than was the case at the higher grade levels. Differences were also found in relative priorities assigned to various mission/problem areas; perhaps the most important of these was the tendency for lower ranking personnel to feel that the current system is inflexible and rigid, while higher ranking personnel do not. These discrepancies are evidence of inadequate communication between rank/grade levels, and perhaps of overcontrol by the more senior field grade officers, at least as seen by their juniors.

Table A
IS TRAINING NOW DYNAMIC

	06-8	05	04-5	01-3	E7-9	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
45. TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE THE TRAINING IN YOUR UNIT AS "DYNAMIC" AS WE USE THE TERM?								
a. Rarely, if ever								
b. A few times								
c. Frequently	2.4	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.9
d. Almost always								

(c) There were also substantial indications of over-commitment and understaffing, together with strong feelings that these affect the commander's ability to conduct dynamic small unit training. There were also indications that small unit commanders may be over-committed insofar as their own time is concerned, perhaps to a point that they cannot participate in the planning and conduct of small unit training to the extent that they would wish.

(Further, it would be possible to speculate that an over-committed small unit commander may find it difficult to provide the best quality of leadership even when he is able to be present.)

(d) While there were many differences across grade levels and across locations, differences between USAREUR responses and CONUS responses were not nearly so pronounced as had been initially expected. This suggests that most of the training problems found to exist are Army-wide rather than peculiar to just one area or theater.

(e) Resources for the conduct of innovative small unit training apparently are not as adequate as respondents would like them to be. There are indications that the available DA literature is not as pertinent as it could be, and that Army Training Programs and Army Subject Schedules, while generally available, are not as useful as, for example, Field Manuals and Technical Manuals. This seems rather paradoxical, and suggests that there is at present a void in the literature resources available to the small unit for the development and conduct of innovative small unit training. Further, there are some indications that in this area, at least, USAREUR units were in greater need than CONUS units.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Plan of Report of Survey	6
Resources and Current Capabilities	6
Training Facilities	13
Current State of Training	19
Problems and Obstacles to More Effective Training	21
Ways of Improving Small Unit Training	42
Summary and Conclusions	49
Appendix	53

TABLES

1 Distribution of Present Sample by Rank, Arm, and Location...	5
2 Availability and Utilization of Conventional Resources for Developing Training	7
3 Rated Usefulness of DA Small-Unit Training Guidance (Materials)	11
4 Availability and Source of Major and Minor Training Facili- ties and Aids	15
5 Rated "Current State of Training" Among Surveyed Units.....	20
6 Obstacles to the Development of More Dynamic Training.....	22
7 Factors Reducing Innovation	27
8 Ratings of Problem Areas	30
9 Estimated Strengths Needed for Dynamic Training	33a
9a Relative Priorities of Mission/Problem Areas and Time Demands Posed.....	34
10 Communication of Training "Suggestions" Between Grades.....	37
11 Evaluation of Own Competencies.....	40
12 The Commander's Participation in Small Unit Training.....	43
13 The Decentralization Directive	46
14 Adventure Training	48
15 Is Training Now Dynamic	51

22 October 1971

ANALYSIS OF TRAINING MANAGEMENT SURVEY

On 30 June 1971, the Chief of Staff of the Army directed that all detailed training management be decentralized to battalion and lower level, that mandatory subjects prescribed by higher headquarters be eliminated, and that training guidance be provided to battalions by mission-type instructions rather than detailed directives. Further, individual training records were no longer to be required.

Each commander must now estimate his own situation, conduct indicated instruction and periodically reappraise the status of his unit's training: Unit readiness to execute mission, the job proficiency of each of its soldiers, and his possession of adequate knowledge of his responsibilities. The Chief of Staff is aware that the trainer faces perplexing problems of inadequate time, limited resources, restricted facilities and personnel turbulence. He calculated that solving these problems would stretch the commanders professionally and allow full play for their energy, enthusiasm, imagination and ingenuity.

The following characterize dynamic training in combat arms units:

a. Training tailored to need from the commander's appraisal of his unit and his soldiers.

b. Training which meets need despite constraints. Unit constantly trains toward commander's training objectives even if hampered by reduced strength, limited training facilities, or other scarce resources.

c. Training in which input by the trainer (instructor) is imaginative, innovative, professionally stretching.

d. Training in which the output for the trainee (student) is job-satisfaction -- a zestful, stimulating, rewarding learning experience.

Commanders and their training managers should be able to draw on the experience of those who have encountered and overcome training difficulties in the past, to tap into the impressive expertise at the service schools for solving new problems, and to become acquainted with innovative solutions devised by contemporaries in the field. To initiate better support in the short range and recommended long term improvements, CSA has directed formation of a Board for Dynamic Training. The Board is composed of representatives of the Artillery, Air Defense Artillery, Armor, and Infantry arms, Active Army Divisions and the Reserve Components. The Board is sited at Fort Benning, and is chaired by Brigadier General P. E. Gorman, Assistant Commandant of the Infantry School.

As one first step in discharging these responsibilities, the Board tasked HumRRO to assist in the development and analysis of a survey, to be administered to experienced officers and enlisted men, to identify the major problems now serving as barriers to the development of innovative, challenging, and stimulating small unit training, Army-wide. The present document is a report of that survey.

At the outset, there were three major hypotheses which were considered feasible:

a. That the present seeming lack of challenging and innovative small unit training could be attributed primarily to the lack of experience among junior commanders and leaders in developing and conducting such training, in large part because of nearly a decade of concentration on the problems of the Vietnam war.

b. That junior commanders and leaders are failing to develop and conduct such training in part because they are the product of a culture which gave them more passive, receiving experiences (e.g., watching television) as opposed to active, accomplishing experiences (e.g., hiking or hunting), than was true of previous generations. (It should be noted that this was viewed as a relatively unlikely hypothesis at the outset by the Board for Dynamic Training.)

c. That the relative lack of dynamic training was the result of systemic problems, that is, too many assigned missions, inadequate resources, and inadequate priorities for the training mission itself.

The survey to be reported herein was designed, in large part, to provide such data which would assist in determining which one(s) of these hypotheses might in fact be correct. In order to accomplish this purpose, it was necessary to collect data from a wide representation of units, arms, and background experience levels. Accordingly, a major effort was made, within the time frame available, to collect data which were representative of Army problems world-wide. Table 1 shows the composition of the sample analyzed for the purposes of this report. Of 802 persons responding, 492 reported on a CONUS unit, 86 on a unit in Europe, and 224 on units in other areas, worldwide, except Southeast Asia. (Southeast Asia was omitted because it was judged that relatively little small unit training is being conducted there.) The large majority of subjects were either company grade officers or senior noncommissioned officers, though a substantial number of relatively senior field grade officers were also obtained in the sample. As can also be seen in the Table, there was a fairly wide sampling across Infantry, Armor, Air Defense, and Field Artillery, with Infantry officers in the company grades constituting the largest single group of survey respondents.

These respondents were screened from a larger number of officers and noncommissioned officers completing the survey forms on the basis of the following criteria. To be included in this survey, the respondent had

Table 1

Distribution of Present Sample
by Rank, Arm, and Location

<u>Rank</u>	<u>RANK BY LOCATION</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>CONUS</u>	<u>Location</u> <u>Europe</u>	<u>Other</u>	
06-08	6	4	6	16
05*	45	0	17	62
04-05**	76	4	26	106
01-03	214	68	83	365
E7-9	<u>151</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>253</u>
TOTAL	492	86	224	802

<u>Rank</u>	<u>RANK BY ARM</u>				<u>Total</u>
	<u>Infantry</u>	<u>Armor</u>	<u>Air</u> <u>Defense</u>	<u>Field</u> <u>Artillery</u>	
06-08	7	5	2	2	16
05*	30	13	3	16	62
04-05**	51	17	7	31	106
01-03	212	66	23	64	365
E7-9	<u>83</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>253</u>
TOTAL	383	150	84	185	802

*05 with more than 3 years in grade and/or Battalion Command experience
 **05 with less than 3 years in grade

to have reported that his last duty assignment to a TOE unit was either as a commander or leader (or sergeant major, first sergeant, or platoon sergeant for noncommissioned officers), or that he was in a staff position as either G3, S3, or an Assistant to one of those (or operations sergeant for noncommissioned officers).

PLAN OF REPORT OF SURVEY

The present survey addresses, as a way of dealing with the three hypotheses mentioned earlier, three major topics in order:

Current resources and present unit capabilities.

Problems and barriers to more effective training.

Ways of possible improvement.

RESOURCES AND CURRENT CAPABILITIES

Table 2 shows responses to the first four questions of the survey, which dealt with the availability and utilization of conventional resources for the development of training. Responses to these questions were obtained on a four-point scale from "never" to "always," as shown at the top of Table 2. The responses indicated in the table are averages of all the responses obtained from all officers and noncommissioned officers broken out by location of unit on which the survey report was based.

Examination of the averages for Item 1 suggests that the differences between locations are not particularly large. In fact, remarkable similarity was found between small units in CONUS and small units in Europe on all except the last two entries for Item 1. Units in

Table 2

Availability and Utilization of Conventional
Resources for Developing Training

Response Scale

	Never 1	Sometimes 2	Usually 3	Always 4	CONUS	Europe	Other
1. DID YOUR BATTALION PROVIDE:							
a. <u>Only</u> oral guidance for the conduct of training.....					2.0	2.0	2.1
b. Written Unit Training Programs.....					3.1	3.0	3.0
c. Written Training Schedules.....					3.5	3.5	3.4
d. Written Training Calendar.....					3.1	3.2	2.8
e. Written Training Reports.....					2.9	3.0	2.9
f. Written Army Training Tests (ATT).....					2.8	2.8	2.6
g. Written Battalion Training Circular.....					2.8	2.9	2.5
h. Written Training Records.....					3.1	3.3	3.0
i. Written Policy File.....					3.2	3.2	3.1
j. Written Operational Readiness Test.....					2.8	3.2	2.9
k. Written School/Center Training Literature.....					2.7	2.4	2.4
2. IN ADDITION TO WRITTEN TRAINING GUIDANCE, TO WHAT EXTENT DID YOU RECEIVE <u>ADDITIONAL</u> ORAL GUIDANCE DIRECTLY FROM EACH OF THE FOLLOWING:							
a. Division CG.....					1.7	1.7	1.6
b. ADC.....					1.6	1.8	1.6
c. Division Staff Officers.....					1.7	1.6	1.7
d. Brigade CO.....					2.1	2.1	2.2
e. Brigade XO.....					1.6	1.4	1.6
f. Brigade Staff Officers.....					2.2	2.1	2.1
g. Battalion CO.....					3.0	3.1	2.9
h. Battalion XO.....					2.4	2.4	2.3
i. Battalion S3.....					3.1	3.1	3.1
j. Battalion S1, S2, or S4.....					2.0	2.0	2.2
k. Company Commander.....					2.9	3.0	3.0

Table 2 (cont'd)

Availability and Utilization of Conventional
Resources for Developing Training

	CONUS	Europe	Other
3. TO WHAT EXTENT DID YOU HAVE ACCESS TO RELEVANT:			
a. Army Training Programs (ATP).....	3.4	3.2	3.1
b. Army Subject Schedules.....	3.4	3.2	3.1
c. Field Manuals (FM).....	3.8	3.8	3.6
d. Technical Manuals (TM).....	3.7	3.6	3.5
e. Army Regulations.....	3.7	3.7	3.6
4. TO WHAT EXTENT DID YOU <u>USE</u> THE FOLLOWING IN CONDUCTING TRAINING:			
a. Army Training Programs (ATP).....	2.8	2.6	2.6
b. Army Subject Schedules.....	2.9	2.6	2.6
c. Field Manuals (FM).....	3.5	3.4	3.4
d. Technical Manuals (TM).....	3.3	3.4	3.2
e. Army Regulations.....	3.1	3.0	3.1

USAREUR reported significantly more frequent provision of written operational readiness tests, and CONUS units reported more frequent availability of written school/center training literature. Considering mission requirements in USAREUR and the close availability of schools to CONUS units, these differences are not surprising.

It is interesting also to examine responses across the various entries, irrespective of location. It is interesting that only oral guidance for the conduct of training was reported to have been provided only "sometimes," in a rather consistent fashion. The implication is that written guidance of one form or another was probably usually provided, which seems to be the case on examining the averages for the other entries. Written training schedules were the most frequently reported written guidance, with written training records, written policy files, and written training calendars following. Written school/center training literature seemed to be the least often available, though it was reported to be provided somewhere between "sometimes" and "usually."

While Item 1 dealt with locally developed (in the main) and maintained written resources for the development and conduct of training, Items 3 and 4 dealt with the availability and utilization of Army-wide materials. Availability was addressed by Question 3. As can be seen from examination of average responses to this item, such materials as Army Training Programs, Army Subject Schedules, and so on were reported to be more frequently available than the type of materials listed in Item 1. The most frequently

available were Field Manuals, with an average response very close to the top of the scale "always." Technical Manuals and Army Regulations were nearly as frequently available.

Even though the differences in the Table between CONUS, USAREUR, and other units are quite small, they still show that to a slight extent, even these Army-wide reference materials are somewhat more available to CONUS units than to units outside CONUS.

Given that these materials were widely available, it was then of interest to learn how frequently they were used. Here, there were notable differences in the relative frequency of use of these materials, though for any one kind of resource material, there was little variation between units as a consequence of their location. Field Manuals were reported most frequently used, followed by Technical Manuals and Army Regulations. Army Training Programs, paradoxically, were least frequently reported used, though even here the frequency of use was only slightly below "usually."

Comparison of Items 3 and 4 suggests, however, that the availability of such DA supplied materials is higher than their utilization. As a check on this, an item was asked concerning the respondent's feelings about such formal small unit training guidance. Responses to this question are shown in Table 3, where a three-point scale was used for responding. It is interesting that the average response from all three locations was exactly the same, falling at a scale point quite close to the middle response, "They are valuable as general guidance but not always that useful

Table 3

Rated Usefulness of DA Small-Unit
Training Guidance (Materials)

	Response Scale	CONUS	Europe	Other
26. WHAT ARE YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT THE FORMAL WRITTEN SMALL-UNIT TRAINING GUIDANCE SUPPLIED BY DA (E.G., ATP'S, ARMY SUBJECT SCHEDULES, TRAINING CIRCULARS, ETC.):				
a. They are very valuable and should always be used as a reference when conducting training.	3			
b. They are valuable as general guidance but not always that useful when training is being conducted.	2	2.1	2.1	2.1
c. They are of little value in that they do not take into consideration important local factors.	1			

when training is being conducted." This rating is particularly significant when related to the difference in utilization of the five entries listed in Item 4, in which Army Training Programs and Army Subject Schedules were least often used of the five. The suggestion might be that improvement is warranted at least in these materials in order to make them more generally useful to small unit trainers.

In addition to written guidance, guidance can also be furnished directly (that is, orally) by anyone of a number of officers from the Division Commanding General down. For the purposes of the present survey, the Company Commander was the lowest commander of interest. The source of possible oral guidance, and the frequency of its occurrence, was checked in Item 2, which is shown in Table 2. While differences between locations are not at all large, differences between command levels are. Specifically, training guidance from division and brigade levels was reported an average of "sometimes" or less. In contrast, guidance was reported from the Battalion CO or the Battalion S3 "usually" or more often, with the Battalion S3 seemingly providing somewhat more training guidance than the Battalion CO. This, of course, is not surprising. Equally unsurprising is the infrequent report of training guidance from other battalion staff officers. One finding in this Table which is of substantial interest, however, is the frequency of receipt of oral guidance from Company Commanders. It seemingly would have been expected that Company Commanders would be as high on oral guidance, or higher, than Battalion S3's and Battalion Commanding Officers. However,

this was not quite the case. To check the possibility that this might have been attributable to the fact that only the lower company grade officers and noncommissioned officers could have reported this kind of oral guidance, responses for this item were checked by rank of respondent (see Appendix, Page 1). Very significantly, the responses of officers at the O-6 level and higher were distributed in a fashion indicating greater guidance from Company Commanders than Battalion S3's, and more from Battalion S3's than from Battalion CO's. However, officers at each other rank level reported exactly the reverse. The noncommissioned officers (E7-E9) reported a guidance distribution much like that of the officers at O-6 and higher levels. These findings suggest fairly strongly that, while officers at brigade command and higher believe that Company Commanders are furnishing most of the oral guidance for training, all other officers believe that most of the oral guidance that is being generated is coming from either the Battalion CO or the Battalion S3. This includes the company grade officers themselves. These findings suggest the possibility that either Company Commanders are not exercising the initiative that senior level commanders expect of them, or that Battalion Commanders may be overcontrolling in the development of training guidance, or both. (This matter will be treated again at a later point.)

Training Facilities

Another point of interest for the present survey was to determine the extent of availability of major and unit generated facilities and materials for training. Average responses to questions concerning these

subjects are presented in Table 4. Again, responses to these questions were on a four-point scale, for Items 5 and 7. For Items 6 and 8, the numbers in the Table represent the percentages of respondents answering "yes" to a "yes"- "no" question. That is, for Item 6, for weapons ranges 14% of respondents indicated that weapons ranges were available from own resources and 86% answered "no." The percentage answering "no" is not shown. Similarly, 77% indicated that areas for individual training were available from own resources, while 23% answered "no." Again, the 23% is not shown.

Examination of the responses to Item 5 indicates that the various major training facilities were available "usually" or more often to CONUS and other units, with one exception, General Field Training Areas, for "other" units. However, for USAREUR units, only Classrooms were as available as for non-USAREUR units, and the other types of facilities were significantly less frequently available, with Weapons Ranges the least often available in comparison with non-USAREUR units. This, of course, is not particularly surprising. What might perhaps be surprising is that the least available of these major facilities was reported available about evenly between "sometimes," and "usually."

Of perhaps more interest is the source from which such facilities were available. (These figures should be interpreted with caution because there is evidence that survey respondents misinterpreted both this question and Question 8.) Examination of the responses for these

Table 4

**Availability and Source of Major and Minor
Training Facilities and Aids**

--
Response Scale

Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
1	2	3	4

5. PLEASE INDICATE HOW OFTEN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING
TRAINING FACILITIES WAS AVAILABLE TO YOU IN
CONDUCTING SMALL-UNIT TRAINING:

	CONUS	Europe	Other
a. Weapons Ranges.....	3.2	2.6	3.1
b. Areas for Individual Training.....	3.3	3.0	3.1
c. Areas for Small-Unit Training.....	3.2	3.0	3.1
d. Classrooms.....	3.4	3.5	3.2
e. General Field Training Areas.....	3.1	2.7	2.9

--
Response: % Answering "Yes"

6. FOR EACH OF THE TRAINING
FACILITIES YOU INDICATED
WERE AVAILABLE AT LEAST
SOMETIMES, PLEASE INDICATE
FROM WHAT SOURCE OR SOURCES
THEY WERE OBTAINED:

	Own Resources			Higher HQ			Central Tng Area		
	CONUS	Europe	Other	CONUS	Europe	Other	CONUS	Europe	Other
a. Weapons Ranges.....	14	25	38	79	84	92	74	93	65
b. Areas for Individual Training.....	77	70	89	82	85	73	54	75	39
c. Areas for Small-Unit Training.....	58	53	73	84	88	80	62	74	50
d. Classrooms.....	88	98	92	92	39	52	23	27	16
e. General Field Train- ing Areas.....	15	18	29	80	64	79	68	94	66

Table 4 (cont'd)

**Availability and Source of Major and Minor
Training Facilities and Aids**

--
Response Scale

Never Sometimes Usually Always
1 2 3 4

**7. PLEASE INDICATE HOW OFTEN EACH OF THE FOLLOW-
ING TRAINING AIDS WAS AVAILABLE TO YOU IN
CONDUCTING SMALL-UNIT TRAINING:**

	CONUS	Europe	Other
a. Actual Equipment.....	3.3	3.3	3.3
b. Models.....	2.2	1.9	1.9
c. Mockups.....	2.2	1.8	1.8
d. Graphic Materials.....	2.7	2.4	2.4
e. Displays.....	2.4	1.9	2.1
f. Chalkboards.....	3.7	3.7	3.3
g. Films.....	3.3	2.8	2.7
h. Sand Tables.....	2.1	2.6	1.8
i. Specially Trained Demonstrators.....	1.8	1.7	1.9
j. Training Demonstrations.....	2.1	1.9	2.0
k. Aggressors and Aggressor Materials.....	2.4	2.1	2.2
l. Prisoner of War Interrogation Personnel.....	1.7	1.5	1.5

--
Response: % Answering "Yes"

**8. FOR EACH OF THE TRAINING
AIDS YOU INDICATED WERE
AVAILABLE AT LEAST SOME-
TIMES, PLEASE INDICATE
FROM WHAT SOURCE OR
SOURCES THEY WERE OBTAINED:**

	Own Resources			Higher HQ			Central Tng Area		
	CONUS	Europe	Other	CONUS	Europe	Other	CONUS	Europe	Other
a. Actual Equipment.....	95	97	97	59	41	53	33	22	26
b. Models.....	46	56	50	69	74	72	73	37	48
c. Mockups.....	34	45	45	65	79	72	80	43	42
d. Graphic Materials.....	64	61	64	71	68	77	82	45	48
e. Displays.....	73	57	69	67	64	73	71	41	34
f. Chalkboards.....	91	98	92	98	42	37	48	25	16
g. Films.....	17	18	20	63	84	75	85	65	68
h. Sand Tables.....	50	80	47	38	29	39	47	25	26
i. Specially Trained Demonstrators.....	54	32	51	59	54	60	34	25	21
j. Training Demonstrations..	67	53	80	64	66	59	34	32	23
k. Aggressors and Aggressor Materials.....	52	74	50	68	61	72	52	39	34
l. Prisoner of War Inter- rogation Personnel.....	20	25	15	66	69	54	24	32	17

entries indicates that, in general, there is a consistent pattern of availability from most entries. That is, entries that are available from own resources for CONUS-based units generally are available from own resources for Europe-based units, etc. However, there were some exceptions. For USAREUR units, there appeared to be a slightly greater frequency of development of weapons ranges from own resources than is true with CONUS units. The same is true of classrooms. Weapons ranges were predominantly more available from the resources of a higher headquarters than own resources for all units, and particularly for units other than either CONUS or USAREUR units. In contrast, USAREUR units seemed to have the largest availability of weapons ranges and central training areas.

Another significant observation from Item 6 is the high percentage of "yes" responses for USAREUR units as to the availability of areas for individual training in a central training area. While USAREUR also reported high availability of such areas from own resources and higher headquarters, a low percentage of "yes" responses for CONUS and other units suggest that central individual training areas are not needed for these units, whereas they might be for USAREUR units. A similar finding exists for general field training areas, with USAREUR units responding quite significantly higher than either CONUS units or other units as to the availability of such areas in central training areas.

Item 7 deals with training aids that might be useful in the conduct of small unit training. Again, with the exception of sand tables, CONUS

units appeared to have a higher degree of availability of all of these aids than USAREUR units, and units in other locations. Those aids most available to USAREUR were chalkboards, actual equipment, films, and sand tables. Models, mockups and displays were reported to be available with an average frequency somewhat lower than "sometimes." This suggests the possibility of a need for greater availability of such materials.

Again, the responses to Item 8 are subject to question, much as were the responses to Item 6. However, to the extent they can be relied upon, there are few particularly notable differences except for the greater availability of such aids in central training areas, as reported by CONUS units, in contrast to USAREUR units. The suggestion is that, when such resources are available to USAREUR units, they are more generally available from their own resources or those of higher headquarters. This, of course, is an expected finding, in that the major central training areas in Europe are basically just that, training areas as opposed to bases where major training resources can be found. Of course, the difficulty here is that most TOE units probably find it rather difficult to accumulate a large quantity of elaborate training aids. The requirement for mission preparedness probably precludes this. It would be this factor then which would account for the generally lower availability of such training aids to USAREUR units in comparison with CONUS units. A possible suggestion would be for provision of such training aids, if this were deemed feasible, to USAREUR units at central locations, where they could be drawn and used as needed as they apparently are with somewhat greater frequency by CONUS units.

Current State of Training

In addition to information about training resources, it was judged desirable to obtain some assessment of the estimated current state of training of present TOE units, as estimated by the officers and non-commissioned officers participating in this survey. Their estimates of their previous or present units' state of training in five subject areas and three general areas are shown in Table 5, with separate break-outs for location, arm, and rank of respondents.

Examination of responses by location indicates little in the way of rated excellence of units' state of training, with regard to location of unit. There is a slight tendency for CONUS units to be rated lower than non-CONUS units, however, and this tendency is perhaps most consistently noted for the three general areas of operational readiness training, unit training, and individual training.

The overall evaluations of these eight areas are also noteworthy, in that some of the average responses fall below the scale point of "adequate." Examination of these ratings by arm are also instructive. There is a strong trend for armor respondents to weight their units lower than respondents from any of the remaining three arms. Further, this trend exists very consistently across all eight areas evaluated.

In an effort to determine whether rank difference of respondent influenced the overall magnitude of the evaluation, responses to these same questions were examined by rank, as shown in Table 5. In the areas covered by Item 42, significant differences across ranks were found only

Table 5
Rated "Current State of Training"
Among Surveyed Units

Response Scale

Inadequate Adequate Excellent
1 2 3

		CONUS	Europe	Other	Infantry	Armor	ADA	FA
42.	IN YOUR UNIT, WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATE OF TRAINING IN THE FOLLOWING SUBJECT AREAS:							
	a. Tactics.....	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.8	2.1	2.0
	b. Weapons.....	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.1	1.9	2.1	2.2
	c. Support.....	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.0
	d. Maintenance.....	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.0
	e. Communication.....	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.9	2.0
43.	IN YOUR UNIT, WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATE OF TRAINING IN THE FOLLOWING GENERAL AREAS:							
	a. Operational Readiness Training.....	1.9	2.2	2.2	2.0	1.8	2.4	2.1
	b. Unit Training.....	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.7	2.0	2.0
	c. Individual Training.....	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.9
42.	IN YOUR UNIT, WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATE OF TRAINING IN THE FOLLOWING SUBJECT AREAS:	06-08	05*	05**-04	01-3	E7-9		
	a. Tactics.....	2.0	1.8	2.0	2.0	1.9		
	b. Weapons.....	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.1	2.0		
	c. Support.....	2.1	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.8		
	d. Maintenance.....	1.9	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.0		
	e. Communication.....	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.0	1.9		
43.	IN YOUR UNIT, WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATE OF TRAINING IN THE FOLLOWING GENERAL AREAS:							
	a. Operational Readiness Training.....	2.3	1.8	2.1	2.0	2.0		
	b. Unit Training.....	2.1	1.7	2.0	2.0	1.9		
	c. Individual Training.....	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.8		

*05 with more than 3 years in grade - and/or Battalion Command experience.

**05 with less than 3 years in grade.

for entry "c. Support." The lower the rank of the respondent, the more likely he was to rate the state of training in regard to support lower on the response scale. Rank differences were also found for the three entries of Item 43, but of a somewhat different sort. For each of these three entries, the most senior field grade officers tended to rate their units considerably higher than did Lieutenant Colonels, the second rank level, and the senior non-commissioned officers (E7-E9), who tended to rate their units only slightly more favorably than did the Lieutenant Colonels. For these latter two groups, the overall state of training in these three general areas fell below the scale point of "adequate" for five of the six observed averages (three averages for each of two rank groups).

Problems and Obstacles to More Effective Training

One of the primary reasons for conducting the survey was to identify reasons, as seen by experienced commanders and leaders with field experience, as to why current training is not more dynamic, and as to what is preventing the development of more dynamic training. Two questions which attempted to identify these reasons were 18 and 19, the results of which are shown in Table 6. The first three columns of Table 6 contain responses by location. Examination of responses across locations suggests the following observations: Officers from USAREUR units were RELATIVELY more concerned about priorities set by higher headquarters, the rigidly prescribed Army training system, and degree of interest in change by immediate seniors. In contrast, they were less concerned about the degree of motivation and the qualifications of junior personnel.

Table 6

Obstacles to the Development of More Dynamic Training

	Average by Location		Rank Order by Grade					Average by Grade				
	CONUS	Europe	Other	06-8	05-5	04-4	01-3	06-8	05-5	04-4	01-3	E7-9
18. TO WHAT EXTENT IS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING A REASON WHY THERE IS NOT MORE DYNAMIC TRAINING FOR ARMY SMALL UNITS:												
a. Insufficient priority set by higher HQ....	2.8	3.0	2.7	7	5	3.5	3	2.4	2.5	2.7	3.0	2.6
b. Inability to change because of the rigidly prescribed Army training system.....	2.6	3.0	2.7	10	7	7	5	1.9	2.3	2.3	2.9	3.5
c. Lack of interest in change by immediate seniors.....	2.1	2.6	2.3	11	11	11	6	1.8	1.6	1.8	2.5	2.2
d. Lack of interest in change by subordinates.....	2.0	2.2	2.1	9	10	10	11	2.1	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.2
e. Personnel turbulence.....	3.2	3.3	3.0	1	1	1	1	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.3	2.8
f. Lack of adequate budget.....	2.9	3.0	2.7	5	3	3.5	3	2.6	2.7	2.7	3.0	2.8
g. Lack of knowledge about exactly what changes to make.....	2.4	2.3	2.3	8	9	9	7	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.4	2.4
h. Inadequate manning levels.....	2.9	3.1	3.0	2	2	2	3	3.2	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.8
i. Lack of imagination among junior personnel.....	2.4	2.3	2.3	5	5	7	10	2.6	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.5
j. Inadequate motivation among junior personnel.....	2.4	2.2	2.4	5	8	7	8.5	2.6	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.6
k. Inadequate qualification of junior personnel.....	2.6	2.3	2.5	3	5	5	8.5	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.8

Response Scale

Not a Factor	A Minor Cause	A Serious Cause	A Major Cause
1	2	3	4

Table 6 (cont'd)

Obstacles to the Development of More Dynamic Training

	CONUS	Europe	Other
19. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING IS THE SINGLE MOST SERIOUS REASON WHY THERE IS NOT MORE DYNAMIC TRAINING FOR ARMY SMALL UNITS:			
a. Insufficient priority set by higher HQ..	16	15	16
b. Inability to change because of the rigidly prescribed Army training system.....	17	23	23
c. Lack of interest in change by immediate seniors	5	8	7
d. Lack of interest in change by subordinates	1	2	2
e. Personnel turbulence.....	28	14	17
f. Lack of adequate budget	9	14	8
g. Lack of knowledge about exactly what changes to make	5	6	5
h. Inadequate manning levels.....	8	9	9
i. Lack of imagination among junior personnel	3	0	3
j. Inadequate motivation among junior personnel	3	4	5
k. Inadequate qualification of junior personnel	7	4	4

Examination of the relative size of the averages shown in the first three columns for Item 18 gives some indication of the relative seriousness of each of these problem areas, regardless of location. As might have been expected, personnel turbulence was judged perhaps the most serious problem, with inadequate manning levels following a close second. Perhaps least serious, overall, was perceived interest in change by either seniors or subordinates. A cross check on these averages was obtained by asking the respondent in Item 19 to select only one of the entries as his nomination for the single most serious reason why there is not more dynamic training for Army small units. These responses are shown in the first three columns for Item 19 in Table 6. There is a clear indication that personnel turbulence is regarded as the most serious factor, and that it is more serious in CONUS than non-CONUS units. Perhaps second most serious is a feeling that change is not possible because of the rigidly prescribed Army training system, a feeling held somewhat more strongly in non-CONUS units. The third factor was identified as insufficient priorities set by higher headquarters, followed by lack of adequate budget.

It was felt that examination of these factors by rank might provide interesting information, and these comparisons are contained in the columns at the right of the Table for Item 18. Two sets of numbers are presented in these columns. The first consists of average responses by grade, in the last five columns. Because of the large quantity of numbers, an effort was made to simplify their presentation by listing within each column a relative rank order, by which the largest average response was given the rank of 1, the next largest the rank of 2, and so on. These

rankings are shown in the middle five columns of the Table. Some highly interesting conclusions follow from these rank comparisons, which suggest that different rank levels have quite different opinions regarding the relative seriousness of some of these factors. While most rank levels agree that personnel turbulence and inadequate manning levels are the most serious, and that lack of interest in change by either seniors or subordinates are perhaps the least serious, the following contradictions occur:

(a) Senior rank levels tend to rate the current Army training system as "a minor cause" of the present problems, whereas more junior rank levels rate this as a more serious cause, with the non-commissioned officers ranking it between "a serious cause" and "a major cause."

(b) The most senior field grade officers and the non-commissioned officers agree in rating the qualifications of junior personnel as a more important cause than do the company grade officers themselves.

(c) Similarly, the more senior field grade officers tend to rate lack of imagination as a more serious cause than do company grade officers and junior field grade officers.

These comparisons suggest some interesting conclusions. First, there is substantial agreement regardless of rank level that personnel turbulence and current manning levels are serious problems. However, there is a tendency for the more senior officers to lack confidence in their juniors, and for the junior to criticize the rigidity of the system within which they operate. This is strongly suggestive of inadequate communications between rank levels as to what is possible and what is desired.

Information presented in the preceding Table was cross checked by a series of other questions throughout the survey instrument. Two of the cross check questions are presented in Table 7. Examination of the average responses to the four alternatives of Item 27 and Item 32 indicate that units experience these problems much to the same extent regardless of where they are located. One possible exception is the tendency for USAREUR units to regard entry b, the amount of subject matter that must be presented, as more serious than non-USAREUR units. The overall levels of response for these entries place them between "a minor limitation" and "a serious limitation." Of the four entries in Item 27, the one which receives most clear cut support as the most important factor is a. "Inspectors from higher levels of command will note deviation from their training guidance and react negatively."

Because such a feeling clearly should be influenced by the rank of the respondent, responses were examined in terms of their rank order by grade, which are shown in the second set of columns for Item 27. (Note: These are rankings of averages, which may be found in the Appendix, page 10.) Examination of these rankings indicates that, again, seniors and juniors have quite different views of some problem areas. The most important factor reducing innovation, in the view of the most senior field grade officers, was the feeling that "Many NCO's and Junior Officers who present training are unused to thinking for themselves and thus they do not develop any innovative techniques on their own." In striking contrast, the company grade officers believe the most important

Table 7
Factors Reducing Innovation

27. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES EACH OF
THE FOLLOWING REDUCE IN-
NOVATION IN ARMY SMALL-
UNIT TRAINING:

	Averages by Location			Rank Order by Grade				
	CONUS	Europe	Other	O6-8	O5	O4-5	O1-3	E7-9
a. Inspectors from higher levels of command will note deviation from their training guidance and react negatively.....	2.8	2.8	2.8	4	1.5	1.5	1	1.5
b. So much subject matter must be presented in a limited amount of time that it is not possible to accomplish anything different from that which is prescribed.....	2.5	2.9	2.6	2	3	3.5	2	3
c. Many NCO's and Junior Officers who present training are unused to thinking for themselves and thus they do not develop any innovative techniques on their own.....	2.5	2.4	2.4	1	1.5	1.5	4	1.5
d. Many trainers and commanders are unaware that they are authorized to take new approaches and use "way out" techniques in training.....	2.4	2.5	2.4	3	4	3.5	3	4

Response Scale

A Major Limitation	A Serious Limitation	A Minor Limitation	Not a Factor
4	3	2	1

Table 7 (cont'd)

Factors Reducing Innovation

		CONUS	Europe	Other
32. WHAT IMPACT DO SAFETY RESTRICTIONS HAVE ON A UNIT'S ABILITY TO CONDUCT DYNAMIC TRAINING:	Response Scale			
a. None at all.....	3			
b. Some hindrance to training...	2	2.2	2.1	2.1
c. Great hindrance to training..	1			

single factor is a. "Inspectors from higher levels of command will note deviation from their training guidance and react negatively." Clearly, this represents a conflict in perceptions and evidence for inadequate communication between seniors and juniors regarding what can and cannot be done, and what should and should not be done in training. A further cross check of problem areas was accomplished in the Items listed in Table 8. These are typical problem areas which had been identified in a survey of battalion commanders at an earlier time. Examination of the averages obtained from CONUS, USAREUR, and Other responses indicates that units experience these problems, in general, to about the same extent, with two exceptions. One is the relatively stronger feeling by USAREUR respondents that training time was limited by too many non-tactical requirements imposed on the unit (Item 3). Their rating of this problem area place it on the response scale between "major" and "grave." In contrast, CONUS units appeared to be more concerned with Item 2, the problem of taking a trained rifleman just out of Vietnam, and retraining him in a different MOS.

While there were few major differences between ratings of the seriousness of these problems areas by unit, there were overall differences in feelings concerning the seriousness of the problem areas themselves. To an extent, this can be seen by examination of the rank order of relative seriousness imposed on these problem areas by the various grades of officers and non-commissioned officers responding. There was general agreement across rank levels that Item 6, pertaining to turnover of personnel, was among the most serious, if not the most serious of all. This, of course,

Table 8

Ratings of Problem Areas

	Averages			Rank Order by Grade				
	CONUS	EMROPE	OTHER	O6-8	O5	O4-5	O1-3	E7-9
1. Lack of motivated junior officers willing to adequately perform their duties.	2.1	2.0	2.2	10	12	11.5	12	11.5
2. Taking a trained rifleman (MOS11b) just out of Vietnam, with an average of 6 months retainability, and re-training him in a different MOS so that he can go through required unit qualification program.	2.9	2.5	2.5	5.5	5	6.5	7	6
3. Training time. Too many nontactical requirements imposed on the unit.	3.2	3.4	3.0	5.5	3	2	1.5	3.5
4. Shortage of qualified NCOs. Have excess E-5 personnel but only a few are E-6 and above. E-5 and E-6 types have knowledge and experience that E-3 or E-4's had a few years ago.	3.1	3.1	3.1	4	2	3	3	3.5
5. Lack of experienced administrative personnel in the hard skill areas capable of keeping abreast of the daily administrative requirements.	2.6	2.7	2.7	2	4	4.5	8	8
6. Complete turnover of personnel every 7 or 8 months and the impact on training.	3.3	3.2	3.2	2	1	1	1.6	3.5
7. "Short-timer" attitude of Viet Nam returnees.	3.0	2.8	2.6	7.5	6	6.5	4	3.5
8. Discipline. The need for stronger discipline in the new changing Army.	2.9	3.0	3.0	2	7	4.5	5.5	1
9. The officers and NCOs are called to perform duties well beyond the normal experience level--for example --line companies commanded by lieutenants with less than 2 years service.	2.2	2.5	2.5	9	10	10	10	10

Table 8 (cont'd)

Ratings of Problem Areas

	Averages			Rank Order by Grade				
	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER	O6-8	O5	O4-5	O1-3	E7-9
10. The training load made difficult by changing priorities of higher headquarters.	2.7	2.8	2.6	7.5	8.5	8	5.5	8
11. Learning how to adjust to a permissive society of free-thinking young lieutenants.	2.1	1.8	2.0	12	13	13	13	11.5
12. A morale problem caused by the fact that our draftee soldiers are serving in an unpopular war and that they are well aware of it.	2.3	2.3	2.4	12	11	11.5	11	8
13. Insuring day-to-day training is conducted.	2.4	2.4	2.3	12	8.5	9	9	13

RESPONSE SCALE

Problem Area is: Grave Major Minor No Problem
 4 3 2 1

confirms findings in Table 6 concerning personnel turbulence. A second factor of major concern was Item 4, shortage of qualified NCOs. Two additional items which stood high on the list, but on which agreement tended to be lacking across rank levels were Item 8, concerning discipline, and Item 3, concerning the number of non-tactical requirements imposed on the unit. For Item 3, on availability of training time, there was a tendency for the lower ranking officers to regard this as a more serious problem than the most senior officers. Conversely, regarding Item 8, discipline, the more senior officers and the non-commissioned officers combined in feeling that this was the highest ranking, or nearly so, problem area, while all other respondents considered it to be substantially lower in overall importance.

Perhaps as important as the factors judged most important are those which were judged relatively lacking in importance. A cluster of five factors can be identified in this Table as being relatively low in overall estimated significance:

(a) Item 1, lack of motivated junior officers willing to adequately perform their duties.

(b) Item 11, learning how to adjust to a permissive society of free-thinking young Lieutenants.

(c) Item 12, a morale problem caused by the fact that our draftee soldiers are serving in an unpopular war and that they are well aware of it.

(d) Item 9, the officers and NCOs are called to perform duties well

beyond the normal experience level--for example--line companies commanded by lieutenants with less than 2 years service.

(e) Item 13, insuring day-to-day training is conducted.

In short, analysis of these items support the following conclusions from the preceding Table:

(a) Personnel turbulence and the personnel management system of the Army constitute major problems for TOE units. Included here is the quantity of non-tactical requirements imposed on the unit.

(b) There is a lack of agreement between juniors and seniors on certain items that seem key to the effective accomplishment of organizational goals and missions.

(c) In general, there is consensus by juniors and seniors that the quality and motivation of personnel is not an issue.

Since it had been anticipated that personnel strength and assigned missions would be major problems uncovered in the survey, specific questions were included to determine respondents' feelings as to unit strengths needed in order for units to have the capability for conducting dynamic training (as opposed to just housekeeping), and to determine what mission and non-mission areas were being given priority with their units.

The data on personnel strength needed for dynamic training are shown in Table 9. The question was asked three times of each respondent, once for platoon level, once for company level, and once for battalion level. In addition, responses were requested for both enlisted and NCO/officer categories; respondents were requested to respond in terms of TOE strength, not assigned strength. Analysis of the averages shown in Table 9 suggests that there are several consistent patterns:

Table 9

Estimated Strengths Needed for Dynamic Training

	RANK	ENLISTED					NCO'S/OFFICERS						
		CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER	OVERALL	IN	AR	ADA	FA	OVERALL	IN	AR	ADA
28.	WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE A MINIMUM PLATOON "PRESENT FOR DUTY" STRENGTH TO ACHIEVE DYNAMIC PLT. TRAINING? (Please answer in terms of TOE strength, <u>not</u> assigned strength.)	06-08 05* 04-05** 01-03 E7-E9 OVERALL	65 84 64 72 - 77 73 75 69 78 76 76 79 79 77 76 79 75 76 75 79 77 76	64 - 77 73 78 76 79 77 75 76 77 76	69 73 76 77 76 76		66 68 88 70 72 78 85 70 74 80 67 70 77 77 76 81 73 74 77 78 75 76 76 77	70	53 87 67 75 - 76 75 78 65 82 78 78 81 83 80 72 82 69 71 76 81 76	67	54 71 89 95 72 83 80 72 76 89 73 78 80 82 76 81 70 70 72 73 76 79 74 77	69 75 78 80 71 77	
29.	WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE A MINIMUM COMPANY "PRESENT FOR DUTY" STRENGTH TO ACHIEVE DYNAMIC CO. TRAINING? (Please answer in terms of TOE strength, <u>not</u> assigned strength.)	06-08 05* 04-05** 01-03 E7-E9 OVERALL	72 79 68 72 - 78 74 75 71 78 76 77 80 80 78 79 78 77 78 77 79 78	68 - 78 74 78 76 80 78 77 81 78 77	72 74 76 78 78 77		69 73 80 75 73 77 88 72 74 79 79 76 77 78 77 79 77 77 81 78 76 78 80 77	72	62 84 63 74 - 78 75 77 75 81 78 79 80 82 80 73 73 70 72 71 79 76	68	60 71 82 80 75 78 80 74 77 81 82 78 80 80 75 80 70 70 74 74 77 76 75 77	69 76 78 80 72 73	
30.	WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE A MINIMUM BATTALION "PRESENT FOR DUTY" STRENGTH TO ACHIEVE DYNAMIC BN. TRAINING? (Please answer in terms of TOE strength, <u>not</u> assigned strength.)	06-08 05* 04-05** 01-03 E7-E9 OVERALL	68 77 70 74 - 78 75 75 70 78 76 77 80 82 79 79 79 80 79 77 79 80	70 - 78 75 78 76 82 79 80 79 78 80	71 75 76 79 79 78		71 66 75 78 75 76 88 73 75 75 76 75 77 78 73 80 80 77 80 79 77 77 78 78	71	71 82 64 76 - 78 77 78 76 80 78 78 81 79 79 76 81 72 75 77 81 76	71	64 77 75 75 77 80 80 73 80 79 81 75 79 82 67 79 74 73 76 76 78 78 74 77	71 77 78 79 75 77	

*05 with more than 3 years in grade and/or Battalion Command experience.

**05 with less than 3 years in grade.

☐ The number in the Square Block is the overall average of all responses

(a) The percentage of TOE strength needed for dynamic training increases with decreasing rank, except that NCO's generally responded much more like the more senior field grade officers in response to the question concerning platoon level, and like the company grade officers in response to most of the other questions.

(b) There was a strong tendency for USAREUR respondents to estimate a higher strength need for dynamic training than did respondents from CONUS units; respondents reporting on "Other" units generally fell between these two extremes.

(c) There were no consistent discernible differences between arms in estimates of strength needed for dynamic training, except that for enlisted personnel, ADA tended to be higher than the others; conversely, Infantry respondents were low in all three estimates concerning enlisted personnel.

(d) When the arms were compared with regard to enlisted vs. officer strength estimated needed, it appeared that for Infantry there were basically no differences; for Armor, it seemed somewhat more important for enlisted strength to be high; for ADA, it was definitely more important for enlisted strength to be high; and for FA there were no discernible differences.

Overall, weighted averages for enlisted and NCO/officer estimates were:

	Enlisted	NCO/Officer
Platoon	76	77
Company	77	73
Battalion	78	77

It is evident from these figures, averaged (weighted) over all locations and all arms, that the percentage of both enlisted and NCO/Officer strength judged necessary for dynamic training approximated about 77%. Further, except at company level, there were only minor differences between enlisted and NCO/Officer estimates at a given level. (Note: It is necessary to exercise caution in the interpretation of these estimates; it has been suggested that respondents may have confused Present for Duty strength with Present for Training strength. Since the question was worded to obtain Present for Duty strength, this is the present interpretation. However, for some respondents, that might not be correct.)

In order to investigate the relative importance of mission and non-mission areas, respondents were asked to rate eight mission or problem areas in terms of the importance attached to these areas by their seniors, by themselves, and in terms of how demanding these areas were on their available time. The responses to these questions are shown in Table 9a.

The data reported in Table 9a were examined from several points of view. First, it was possible to examine the relative importance of each of these areas, across locations, in terms of perceptions of seniors' feelings, own feelings, and how demanding of own time. The first three columns are perceptions by respondents of the feelings of their seniors. Two location-type differences immediately stand out in the Table. One is

Table 9a

Relative Priorities of Mission/Problem Areas and Time Demands Posed

	Importance Attached by Seniors			Importance Attached by Self			How Demanding of Own Time by Location			How Demanding of Own Time by Grade				How Demanding of Own Time: Rank Order by Grade			
	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER	06-8	05	04-5	01-3	06-8	05	04-5	01-3
1. Drug Abuse Control	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.8	2.7	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.2	2.9	2.8	6	7	7
2. Community Relations	2.9	3.0	3.1	2.7	2.5	2.9	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.6	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.3	8	8	8
3. Race Relations	3.7	4.0	3.9	3.4	3.9	3.7	2.7	3.5	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.4	3.1	2.8	5	5	6
4. Small Unit Training	3.6	3.3	3.7	4.3	4.4	4.2	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.7	4	4	2
5. Command Inspections	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.8	3.2	2.7	2.8	3.2	3.4	3.1	7	6	5
6. Operational Missions	4.0	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.5	3.9	3.8	4.1	4.6	3.7	4.1	3.8	3.9	1	2.5	1
7. Vehicular Maintenance	3.9	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.4	3.9	3.5	4.1	4.0	3.3	3.6	3.4	2	1	4
8. Administration	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3	2.5	3
Response Scale:	Most Demanding/Important			Above Average			Average			Below Average			Least Demanding/Important				
	5			4			3			2			1				

the relatively greater emphasis on command inspections reported by USAREUR units, and the relatively smaller emphasis on small unit training. Administration also tended to be reported to have less importance by USAREUR units than by non-USAREUR units.

While differences across locations were not readily apparent in the ratings attached by the individuals themselves to these areas, comparisons of these latter ratings with feelings of importance attached by seniors revealed some substantial differences. For example, respondents tended to rate small unit training and operational missions quite high, the average responses for both falling between scale positions indicating "Most Demanding/Important" and "Above Average." In both cases, perceptions were that their seniors attached substantially less significance to these areas. In contrast, respondents felt that their seniors attached considerably more importance to command inspections than they themselves did.

Considering only the rated importance of these areas as determined by respondents themselves, it appeared that the three most important areas were operational missions, small unit training, and vehicular maintenance. Perhaps the least important area was community relations.

Table 9a also contains information as to how demanding each of these mission or problem areas was of the respondent's time, both by location and by grade. The third set of columns yielded a distribution of time demands that was very similar to the distribution of importance as rated by respondents in the second set of columns. Operational missions,

vehicular maintenance, and small unit training were all reported to be between "average" and "above average" in terms of time demands. Interestingly, administration was as high in time demands, however, as these preceding three, though administration had not been rated as high in importance. It is worth noting also that USAREUR units reported higher investments of time in vehicular maintenance and command inspections than non-USAREUR units did.

Time demands were also examined by grade of respondent, and this information is shown in the two sets of five columns each at the right of Table 9a. These show, in turn, average responses, and the rank ordering of these average responses by grade. It can be seen that operational missions were the most demanding at all grade levels except that of senior O-5. The first three, as judged across all rank levels, were operational missions, vehicular maintenance, and administration. For the more junior grades, including the senior non-commissioned officer grades, the second in importance was small unit training. However, this was not the case at battalion command and higher. For all grade levels, the two areas which required the least investment of time were community relations and drug abuse control.

It will be recalled that data presented in earlier tables raised a question as to the degree of communication between grade levels concerning certain kinds of problem areas. The survey instrument contained items designed to check to some extent on the degree of communication between grades, concerning small unit training. These items are shown in Table 10,

Table 10
Communication of Training "Suggestions" Between Grades

	Location		Grade				
	CONUS	EUROPE OTHER	06-8	05	04-5	01-3	E7-9
13. DO YOU MAKE SUGGESTIONS TO YOUR SENIORS ON HOW SMALL UNIT TRAINING COULD BE IMPROVED: (Circle only one)							
3. Never 2. Occasionally 1. Frequently	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.6
1.6							
1.6							
14. THESE SUGGESTIONS ARE GENERALLY:							
a. (5) Accepted and implemented into training							
b. (4) Seemingly accepted but rarely implemented							
c. (3) Seemingly rejected but are sometimes implemented later	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.7	4.2	4.2
d. (2) Rejected and never implemented							
e. (1) Did not make suggestions							
15. DO YOU MAKE SUGGESTIONS TO YOUR SUBORDINATES ON HOW SMALL UNIT TRAINING COULD BE IMPROVED: (Circle only one)							
3. Never 2. Occasionally 1. Frequently	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.5
1.5							
16. THESE SUGGESTIONS ARE GENERALLY:							
a. (5) Improved upon by imaginative subordinates							
b. (4) Carried out as you would have wanted							
c. (3) Carried out, but in an unimaginative fashion	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.7
d. (2) Sometimes <u>not</u> carried out							
e. (1) Did not make suggestions							

both by location, and by grade of respondent. Examination of Items 13 and 15 taken together indicates that suggestions concerning small unit training are made by juniors to seniors somewhat more frequently than in the reverse direction. Examination of these two items by grade level, in the set of five columns at the right of Table 10, suggests that the frequency of such suggestions is generally higher in the junior field grade officer rank levels. (In this Table, for Items 13 and 15, the smaller the number, the greater the frequency.) Correspondingly, the frequency of acceptance and implementation of such suggestions is also higher for this grade group. This is not surprising, since these officers would have been almost exclusively staff officers in their last TOE duty assignment. Thus, a large part of their job duties consists of making suggestions and they could fairly expect to have these suggestions accepted and implemented.

There were virtually no differences between grade levels as to the frequency of making suggestions about small unit training to their own juniors, or the frequency of the acceptance of these suggestions. It is interesting that the average response level, both when considered by location and by grade, falls just short of the scale position labeled "carried out as you would have wanted."

The questionnaire also contained questions to assess the respondent's own attitudes toward his ability to develop innovative and dynamic small unit training, and the feasibility of conducting such training outside of established schools and centers with limited resources. These items are

presented in Table 11. When respondents assessed the four areas listed in Item 17, with respect to its relevance to themselves, there appeared to be few major differences across grade levels. Expertise about specific subject matter was rated as the least serious obstacle, falling at a point for most grade levels that approximated "minor." Lack of training in small unit training techniques occupied, overall, a somewhat more serious spot, falling between "minor" and "serious." Overall, the one generally rated as most serious across all rank levels was lack of familiarity with techniques of field training in general, including the use of field expedients. However, even this was rated only between "minor" and "serious." No average rating was as high as "serious." It thus appears that most respondents had a reasonable degree of confidence in their own abilities to develop innovative and dynamic small unit training.

This overall confidence seems to be corroborated by responses to Item 25, on which respondents were asked to estimate the feasibility of conducting such training with meager resources. The average response to this question very closely approximated the scale position of "adequate training can be conducted with minor difficulty."

Table 11 also contains one additional item, the results of which are particularly interesting in the present context. On this item, respondents were asked to rate the instruction they have received on how to train small units. As can be seen from Table 11, the responses for senior officers were considerably more favorable toward their past training than were the responses of company grade officers. Senior field grade officers

Table 11

Evaluation of Own Competencies

Grade				
06-8	05	04-5	01-3	E7-9

17. TO WHAT EXTENT IS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING AN OBSTACLE TO YOUR DEVELOPING INNOVATIVE AND DYNAMIC SMALL UNIT TRAINING (Circle one response for each of the following)

a. Lack of training in small unit training techniques	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.4
b. Lack of expertise about specific subject matter (e.g., Weapons, Land Navigation)	2.1	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.4
c. Lack of knowledge about what standards of performance to expect in small unit training	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.4
d. Lack of familiarity with the techniques of field training in general, including the use of field expedients	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.4

RESPONSE SCALE

4. Major Obstacle	3. Serious Obstacle	2. Minor Obstacle	1. No Problem	Location		
				Grade		
06-8	05	04-5	01-3	E7-9	CONUS	EUROPE OTHER

25. HOW DO YOU VIEW THE CONDUCT OF SMALL UNIT TRAINING OUTSIDE OF AN ESTABLISHED SCHOOL/CENTER USING FEW ASSISTANTS AND LIMITED FACILITIES AND RESOURCES:

a. (4) Impossible to conduct adequate training in such a context	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.2
b. (3) Adequate training can be conducted only with very great difficulty							
c. (2) Adequate training can be conducted with minor difficulty							
d. (1) No problems. Training qualitatively comparable to that given in a school/center can be conducted with no difficulty, if the commander has initiative and resourcefulness							

Table 11 (con't)

Evaluation of Own Competencies

		Grade				
		06-8	05	04-5	01-3	E7-9
11.	IN GENERAL, THE INSTRUCTION I HAVE RECEIVED ON HOW TO TRAIN SMALL UNITS GAVE ME:					
	(Circle only one)					
a.	Completely adequate information for the training of small units					4
b.	Some useful information but not completely adequate					3
c.	Very little useful information					2
d.	No useful information	3.3	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.1

responded with an average scale position between "completely adequate information" and "some useful information but not completely adequate." Company grade officers, on the other hand, yielded an average response that fell below "some useful information but not completely adequate." It can be concluded that either the more senior field grade officer have been given more training on small unit training, or that their past training was better than training currently being received by company grade officers, or a combination of these two. (It is also possible, of course, that one or the other, or both, of these grade groups are incorrectly recalling the adequacy of their past training.)

Ways of Improving Small Unit Training

The questionnaire also attempted to obtain information on possible ways of improving small unit training. Three major categories of questions dealt with the commander's perceived freedom to commit his time to the development and conduct of such training, the Chief of Staff's directive concerning decentralization of responsibility for small unit training, and adventure training.

Table 12 shows responses to four questions dealing with the extent to which respondents felt the training could be improved by having the commander influence both the planning and conduct of training through his own energy, enthusiasm, and leadership, as well as the degree to which he felt free to provide this. Responses to Questions 20 and 22, which pertain to the potential influence of the commander, indicated that respondents generally felt that the commander can contribute to a very material extent by being present and showing energy, enthusiasm,

Table 12

The Commander's Participation in Small Unit Training

	06-8	05	04-5	01-3	E7-9	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
20. TO WHAT EXTENT CAN SMALL UNIT TRAINING BE IMPROVED BY HAVING THE COMMANDER (OR TRAINING SUPERVISOR) SHOW A GREAT DEAL OF ENERGY, ENTHUSIASM, AND LEADERSHIP WHEN SUCH TRAINING IS BEING CONDUCTED:								
a. Very significantly	4.6	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3
b. To a major degree								
c. To a moderate degree								
d. To a minor degree								
e. Not at all								
21. HOW FREE ARE YOU TO PROVIDE THIS LEADERSHIP, ENERGY, AND ENTHUSIASM WHEN SUCH TRAINING IS TO BE CONDUCTED IN YOUR UNIT:								
a. Nothing prohibits me from doing	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6
b. There are occasional times when I cannot do so								
c. There are many times when other responsibilities prohibit me from doing so								
d. Most of the time, other responsibilities prohibit me from doing so								
22. TO WHAT EXTENT CAN SMALL UNIT TRAINING BE IMPROVED BY HAVING THE COMMANDER (OR TRAINING SUPERVISOR) SHOW A GREAT DEAL OF ENERGY, ENTHUSIASM, AND LEADERSHIP WHEN SUCH TRAINING IS BEING PLANNED:								
a. Very significantly	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.4
b. To a major degree								
c. To a moderate degree								
d. To a minor degree								
e. Not at all								

Table 12 (cont'd)

The Commander's Participation in Small Unit Training

	06	05	04-5	01-3	E7-9	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
23. HOW FREE ARE YOU TO PROVIDE THIS LEADERSHIP, ENERGY, AND ENTHUSIASM WHEN SUCH TRAINING IS BEING PLANNED IN YOUR UNIT:								
a. Nothing prohibits me from doing so	4							
b. There are occasional times when I cannot do so	3							
c. There are many times when other responsibilities prohibit me from doing so.	2							
d. Most of the time, other responsibilities prohibit me from doing so.	1							

and leadership during both the planning and conduct of small unit training. Average responses for all rank levels and across all locations fell between the highest and next to highest scale positions, with most responses being close to, though higher than "to a major degree." However, responses to Questions 21 and 23, concerning the commander's freedom to provide this leadership, energy, and enthusiasm, show a considerably different picture. Average responses for both of these questions fell quite near the scale response "there are occasional times when I cannot do so," and average responses for the more junior officers fell approximately halfway between that point and the lower point, "there are many times when other responsibilities prohibit me from doing so." Examination of these two questions in relationship to one another suggests that the commander is more likely to be free to participate in the planning of training than in its conduct.

The questions presented in Table 13 were intended to determine whether respondents in the present sample were aware of the Chief of Staff's decentralization directive, and to learn their reactions to it in terms of the impact they believe it will have on small unit training. As might have been expected, awareness of this directive decreased with decreasing grade. The more senior field grade officers responded uniformly in the affirmative to Question 33. However, less than three-fourths of the responding company grade officers had heard of it. When these responses were examined across location, it appears that CONUS and USAREUR units were approximately equally well informed on this directive, with units in other locations having heard of the directive less frequently. Item 36 requested respondents to estimate the effect of the directive on the

Table 13
The Decentralization Directive

On 30 June 1971, the Chief of Staff of the Army directed that all detailed training management be decentralized to battalion and lower level, that mandatory subjects prescribed by higher headquarters be eliminated, and that training guidance be provided to battalions by mission-type instructions rather than detailed directives. Also, that individual training records will no longer be required.

		Grade			Location		
		06-8	05	04-5	01-3	E7-9	CONUS EUROPE OTHER

33. HAD YOU HEARD OF THIS DIRECTIVE BEFORE RECEIVING THE PRESENT SURVEY? (If your answer to Question 33 is "Yes," answer Question 34; if "No," go on to Question 35.)

100%	97%	84%	72%	73%	80%	81%	70%
------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

34. WHAT EFFECT HAS THIS DIRECTIVE HAD ON THE TRAINING OF YOUR UNIT?

- a. (3) A significant effect
- b. (2) Some effect
- c. (1) No effect at all

2.2	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.0
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

35. BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCE, DO YOU THINK THAT THIS DIRECTIVE WILL LEAD TO MORE "DYNAMIC TRAINING" IN YOUR UNIT?

(Circle response that comes closest to your evaluation)

- a. (4) Should have favorable impact immediately (within 3 months)
- b. (3) Should help significantly but it will take time for the system to adjust (improvement after 3 months)
- c. (2) I do not believe decentralization will necessarily lead to dynamic training but it might help a little
- d. (1) Decentralizing responsibility won't help at all

2.8	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.0
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

training of their own units. The average response approximated the middle of the scale, "some effect." (However, these responses are probably open to question. Many respondents in the present sample were obtained from Advanced Course classes, and in many cases must have departed the prior units on which they were reporting before the Chief of Staff's directive was issued.) More confidence probably can be placed on answers to Item 35, which in essence asks respondents whether they think that decentralization will lead to more dynamic training. Average responses are fairly similar across rank levels, and across locations, with the average response falling approximately at the scale position "should help significantly but it will take time for the system to adjust (improvement after three months)." There was a trend for the more senior grade officers to be somewhat less optimistic than the company grade officers.

The survey also queried respondents concerning their knowledge of adventure training, and their attitudes toward it. These items are contained in Table 14. The responses contained in the Table to Item 37 are the percentages of each of the groups answering that they were familiar with adventure training. It is interesting that knowledge of adventure training decreases sharply with grade level, with company grade officers and non-commissioned officers least often responding that they were familiar with the concept. With regard to location, CONUS units were more likely to have knowledge of this kind of training than non-CONUS units. Item 38 presents respondents' evaluation of adventure training. Average responses for all groups except the most senior field grade officers fell approximately

Table 14
ADVENTURE TRAINING

	06-8	05	04-5	01-3	E7-9	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
37. SOME UNITS IN THE ARMY CONDUCT SMALL UNIT TRAINING THAT IS CALLED "ADVENTURE TRAINING." ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THIS TYPE OF TRAINING?	79	82	71	57	48	61	51	55
38. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF "ADVENTURE TRAINING" AS A MEANS OF TRAINING FOR <u>YOUR</u> UNIT? *								
a. Excellent								
b. Good								
c. Poor	2.6	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.2
d. My unit is not equipped to conduct such training								
39. RECENTLY A SPECIAL FORCES TEAM RE-ENACTED THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION BY MARCHING AND BOATING ACROSS THE WESTERN PORTION OF THE UNITED STATES. DO YOU THINK YOUR UNIT WOULD BE INTERESTED IN THIS TYPE OF TRAINING PROJECT?	38	77	73	80	58	74	75	64
40. DO YOU THINK YOUR UNIT IS CAPABLE OF CONDUCTING SUCH AN EXPEDITION?								
a. No, because of lack of training and equipment for this type of operation								
b. Perhaps, if provided special training and equipment	2.1	1.9	1.7	1.8	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.9
c. Yes								

* Survey instructions were to the effect that Item 38 was answered only by respondents who had answered "Yes" to Item 37.

one-third of a scale point higher than "good," toward the scale point of "excellent." The senior field grade officers were considerably more negative toward adventure training. Responses to the next question, concerning respondents' beliefs that their units would be interested in a type of adventure training, support the responses to 38. Senior field grade officers were considerably less likely to believe their units would be interested, and company grade officers were highest in the belief that such a training project would be of interest. Further, the company grade officers and junior field grade officers were more likely to believe that their units would be capable of such training than were either the senior field grade officers or the non-commissioned officers.

Summary and Conclusions

It will be clear to anyone who examines the Appendix that the present report does not elaborate all the data actually contained in the survey results. An attempt has been made to restrict the discussion to those findings of greatest salience, from the point of view of identifying the problem (to the extent the problem can be identified in a survey instrument), and factors that bear on the problem. To the extent that overall conclusions can be drawn from the data collected in this survey and discussed in the preceding pages, they probably would be:

(a) Overall, there is substantial confidence at all rank levels in the motivation and quality of small unit commanders and leaders. This suggests that there would be no universal support for the proposition that these leaders and commanders are basically lacking in ability, which would correspond to Hypothesis 2 in the Introduction. There is a feeling at the

lower rank levels that their training for conducting small unit training has not been as adequate as it might have been.

(b) There are substantial indications in the survey results that seniors and subordinates do not see eye-to-eye on many key points and expectations, many of which have to do with the present quality of small unit training, the possibility of improvement, and the ways in which improvement might be effected. As an example, Table 15 shows responses to a question as to whether respondents would characterize training in their units as dynamic, as the term was used in the survey instrument. There was a substantial tendency for personnel at the lower grade levels to believe that their units' training was less frequently "dynamic" than was the case at the higher grade levels. Differences were also found in relative priorities assigned to various mission/problem areas; perhaps the most important of these was the tendency for lower ranking personnel to feel that the current system is inflexible and rigid, while higher ranking personnel do not. These discrepancies are evidence of inadequate communication between rank/grade levels, and perhaps (as was speculated earlier) of overcontrol by the more senior field grade officers, at least as seen by their juniors.

(c) There were also substantial indications of over-committment and understaffing, together with strong feelings that these affect the commander's ability to conduct dynamic small unit training. There were also indications that small unit commanders may be over-committed insofar as their own time is concerned, perhaps to a point that they cannot participate in the planning and conduct of small unit training to the extent that they would wish.

Table 15
IS TRAINING NOW DYNAMIC

	06-8	05	04-5	01-3	E7-9	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
45. TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE THE TRAINING IN YOUR UNIT AS "DYNAMIC" AS WE USE THE TERM?								
a. Rarely, if ever								
b. A few times								
c. Frequently								
d. Almost always								
	2.4	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.9

(Further, it would be possible to speculate that an over-committed small unit commander may find it difficult to provide the best quality of leadership even when he is able to be present.) To a major extent, this supports Hypothesis 3 in the Introduction.

(d) While there were many differences across grade levels and across locations, differences between USAREUR responses and CONUS responses were not nearly so pronounced as had been initially expected. This suggests that most of the training problems found to exist are Army-wide rather than peculiar to just one area or theater. To the extent that these training problems represent system demands on the small unit that exceed its capacity, based on resources available, then these results also support Hypothesis 3 in the Introduction.

(e) Resources for the conduct of innovative small unit training apparently are not as adequate as respondents would like them to be. There are indications that the available DA literature is not as pertinent as it could be, and that Army Training Plans and Army Subject Schedules, while generally available, are not as useful as, for example, Field Manuals and Technical Manuals. This seems rather paradoxical, and suggests that there is at present a void in the literature resources available to the small unit for the development and conduct of innovative small unit training. Further, there are some indications that in this area, at least, USAREUR units were in greater need than CONUS units.

A P P E N D I X

to

Consulting Report

ANALYSIS OF TRAINING MANAGEMENT SURVEY

[illegible]

	NEVER 1				SOMETIMES 2				USUALLY 3				ALWAYS 4			
	06-08	05>3, Bn CO	04, 05<3	01-03	E7-E9	IN	AR	ADA	FA	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER				
2.7	2.9	1.8	2.0	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	
3.4	3.2	3.3	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
3.8	3.1	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4	
3.6	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.2	2.8	3.2	2.8	2.8	
3.2	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.9	
3.1	2.7	3.1	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.8	3.1	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.6	
2.8	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.5	2.9	2.5	2.5	
3.0	2.7	3.3	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.3	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.0	
3.5	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.1	
3.2	2.8	3.0	2.6	3.1	3.1	2.7	2.8	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.2	2.9	3.2	2.9	2.9	
2.5	2.5	2.9	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	
2.1	1.9	1.9	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.6	1.3	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	
2.4	2.0	1.9	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.3	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.6	
2.0	1.8	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.7	
2.4	2.6	2.6	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.3	2.1	1.8	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.2	
1.8	1.6	1.9	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.6	
2.2	2.2	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.1	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	
3.0	2.7	3.4	3.0	2.8	2.8	3.1	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.9	
2.6	1.9	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.3	
3.3	2.7	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	
2.0	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.4	2.4	2.0	1.9	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.2	2.2	
3.5	2.2	3.0	2.8	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.1	3.1	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
3.1	3.7	3.1	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.1	
3.3	3.7	3.6	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.1	
3.8	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.6	
3.8	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5	
3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.5	

ALL

CONUS
EUROPE

- (Circle one response for each of the following)
- a. Only oral guidance for the conduct of training
- b. Written Unit Training Programs.....
- c. Written Training Schedules.....
- d. Written Training Calendar.....
- e. Written Training Reports.....
- f. Written Army Training Tests (ATT).....
- g. Written Battalion Training Circular.....
- h. Written Training Records.....
- i. Written Policy File.....
- j. Written Operational Readiness Test.....
- k. Written School/Center Training Literature.....

SOMETIMES	USUALLY
2	3

- (Circle one response for each of the following)

SOMETIMES	²	USUALLY	³
-----------	--------------	---------	--------------

- (Circle one response for each of the following)
- Army Training Programs (ATP).....
 - Army Subject Schedules.....
 - Field Manuals (FM).....
 - Technical Manuals (TM).....
 - Army Regulations.....

7
ALW

NEVER
1

IN ADDITION TO WRITTEN TRAINING GUIDANCE, TO WHAT EXTENT DID YOU RECEIVE ADDITIONAL ORAL GUIDANCE DIRECTLY FROM EACH OF THE FOLLOWING:

NEVER
1

TO WHAT EXTENT DID YOU HAVE ACCESS TO RELEVANT:
(Circle one response for each of the following)

a.	Army Training Programs (ATP)
b.	Army Subject Schedules
c.	Field Manuals (FM)
d.	Technical Manuals (TM)
e.	Army Regulations

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDG

NEVER
1

SOMETIMES
2

USUALLY
3

ALWAYS
4

CONUS
2.8 2.9 3.5 3.3 3.1

EUROPE
2.6 2.6 3.4 3.4 3.0

OTHER
2.6 2.6 3.4 3.2 3.1

IN
2.7 2.9 2.4 2.8

AR
2.9 2.9 2.4 2.8

ADA
3.5 3.5 3.4 3.5

RA
3.1 3.1 3.1 3.2

06-08
2.7 2.9 2.4 2.8

05-09
2.8 2.9 2.4 2.8

05-10
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-11
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-12
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-13
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-14
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-15
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-16
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-17
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-18
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-19
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-20
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-21
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-22
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-23
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-24
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-25
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-26
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-27
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-28
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-29
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-30
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

05-31
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-01
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-02
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-03
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-04
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-05
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-06
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-07
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-08
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-09
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-10
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-11
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-12
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-13
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-14
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-15
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-16
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-17
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-18
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-19
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-20
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-21
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-22
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-23
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-24
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-25
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-26
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-27
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-28
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-29
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-30
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

06-31
3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5

WHENEVER DESIRED
4

FREQUENTLY
3

SOMETIMES
2

NEVER
1

TE HOW OFTEN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING
ILITIES WAS AVAILABLE TO YOU IN
ALL UNIT TRAINING:

response for each of the following)

anges.....

Individual Training.....

Small Unit Training.....

s.....

Field Training Areas.....

THE TRAINING FACILITIES YOU INDI-
AVAILABLE AT LEAST SOMETIMES, PLEASE
WHAT SOURCE OR SOURCES THEY WERE

ropriate responses for each column)

anges.....

Individual Training.....

Small Unit Training.....

s.....

Field Training Areas.....

anges.....

Individual Training.....

Small Unit Training.....

s.....

Field Training Areas.....

tion No. 6 indicates percentage responding "Yes".

2

4. TO WHAT EXTENT DID YOU USE THE FOLLOWING IN CONDUCTING TRAINING:
(Circle one response for each of the following)

- a. Army Training Programs (ATP).....
- b. Army Subject Schedules.....
- c. Field Manuals (FM).....
- d. Technical Manuals (TM).....
- e. Army Regulations.....

NEVER 1	SOMETIMES 2	USUALLY 3	ALWAYS 4
06-08	05-03	04-02	03-01
06-08	05-03	04-02	03-01
2.7	2.9	2.4	2.8
2.8	3.0	2.4	2.8
3.3	3.4	2.4	2.8
3.3	3.1	3.5	3.5
3.0	3.1	3.5	3.4
	3.1	3.1	3.2

5. PLEASE INDICATE HOW OFTEN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING TRAINING FACILITIES WAS AVAILABLE TO YOU IN CONDUCTING SMALL UNIT TRAINING:

- (Circle one response for each of the following)
- a. Weapons Ranges.....
- b. Areas for Individual Training.....
- c. Areas for Small Unit Training.....
- d. Classrooms.....
- e. General Field Training Areas.....

NEVER 1	SOMETIMES 2	FREQUENTLY 3	WHENEVER DESI 4
06-08	05-03	04-02	03-01
06-08	05-03	04-02	03-01
3.3	3.3	3.1	3.2
3.4	3.4	3.0	3.3
3.3	3.3	3.0	3.2
3.4	3.2	3.4	3.4
3.3	3.1	2.9	3.1

6. FOR EACH OF THE TRAINING FACILITIES YOU INDICATED WERE AVAILABLE AT LEAST SOMETIMES, PLEASE INDICATE FROM WHAT SOURCE OR SOURCES THEY WERE OBTAINED:

- (Circle appropriate responses for each column)
- a. Weapons Ranges.....
- b. Areas for Individual Training.....
- c. Areas for Small Unit Training.....
- d. Classrooms.....
- e. General Field Training Areas.....

OWN RESOURCES	HIGHER HEADQUARTERS
21	23
77	79
60	64
84	89
18	24
13	16
76	74
41	46
97	97
17	19
8	14
80	83
70	66
96	88
15	14
67	44
84	89
73	73
84	84
60	21

- a. Weapons Ranges.....
- b. Areas for Individual Training.....
- c. Areas for Small Unit Training.....
- d. Classrooms.....
- e. General Field Training Areas.....

100	87	86	74
80	85	90	74
80	86	88	74
67	65	71	64
100	82	81	80

NOTE: Question No. 6 indicates percentage responding "Yes".

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

CENTRAL TRAINING AREA										
.....	80	59	80	74	81	a.	79	79	55	75
Individual Training.....	60	54	62	50	52	b.	57	61	30	51
Small Unit Training.....	50	56	75	57	60	c.	63	64	38	63
.....	33	8	19	21	32	d.	23	19	21	21
.....	100	63	79	67	73	e.	72	74	53	74
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										
.....										

[illegible]

tion No. 6 indicates percentage responding "Yes".

6. (Continued)
- a. Weapons Ranges.....
 - b. Areas for Individual Training.....
 - c. Areas for Small Unit Training.....
 - d. Classrooms.....
 - e. General Field Training Areas.....

CENTRAL TRAINING AREA

80	59	80	74	81	a.	79	55	75	74	93
60	54	62	50	52	b.	57	30	51	54	75
50	56	75	57	60	c.	63	38	63	62	74
33	8	19	21	32	d.	23	21	21	23	27
100	63	19	67	73	e.	72	53	74	68	94

7. PLEASE INDICATE HOW OFTEN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING TRAINING AIDS WAS AVAILABLE TO YOU IN CONDUCTING SMALL UNIT TRAINING:

- (Circle one response for each of the following)
- a. Actual Equipment.....
 - b. Models.....
 - c. Mockups.....
 - d. Graphic Materials.....
 - e. Displays.....
 - f. Chalkboards.....
 - g. Films.....
 - h. Sand Tables.....
 - i. Specially trained demonstrators.....
 - j. Training Demonstrations.....
 - k. Aggressors and Aggressor Materials.....
 - l. Prisoner of War Interrogation Personnel.....

NEVER 1
SOMETIMES 2
FREQUENTLY 3
WHENEVER DESIRED 4

06-08	05-03, Bn CO	04, 05-03	01-03	E7-E9	IN	AR	ADA	FA	CONUS	EUROPE
3.8	3.6	3.6	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3
2.3	2.2	2.3	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.1	1.8	2.2	2.2	1.9
2.2	2.2	2.3	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.0	1.7	2.1	2.2	1.8
3.1	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.4
2.5	2.4	2.5	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.4	1.9
3.6	3.0	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.7
3.0	3.4	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.3	2.8
2.6	2.2	2.2	2.1	1.9	2.3	2.1	1.6	1.8	2.1	2.6
2.2	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.7
2.2	2.1	2.2	1.9	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.2	2.1	1.9
2.8	2.7	2.5	2.1	2.4	2.3	2.4	1.9	2.3	2.4	2.1
2.0	1.9	1.8	1.5	1.7	1.8	1.6	1.2	1.5	1.7	1.5

NOTE: Question No. 6 indicates percentage responding "yes".

4

THE

9

;

व

1

25

6

3. FOR EACH OF THE TRAINING AIDS YOU INDICATED

WERE AVAILABLE AT LEAST SOME, USE

INDICATE FROM WHAT SOURCE OR SOURCES THEY

WERE OBTAINED:

(Circle appropriate responses for each column)

- a. Actual Equipment.....
- b. Models.....
- c. Mockups.....
- d. Graphic Materials.....
- e. Displays.....
- f. Chalkboards.....
- g. Films.....
- h. Sand Tables.....
- i. Specially Trained Demonstrators.....
- j. Training Demonstrations.....
- k. Aggressors and Aggressor Materials.....
- l. Prisoner of War Interrogation Personnel.....

- a. Actual Equipment.....
- b. Models.....
- c. Mockups.....
- d. Graphic Materials.....
- e. Displays.....
- f. Chalkboards.....
- g. Films.....
- h. Sand Tables.....
- i. Specially Trained Demonstrators.....
- j. Training Demonstrations.....
- k. Aggressors and Aggressor Materials.....
- l. Prisoner of War Interrogation Personnel.....

- a. Actual Equipment.....
- b. Models.....
- c. Mockups.....
- d. Graphic Materials.....
- e. Displays.....
- f. Chalkboards.....
- g. Films.....
- h. Sand Tables.....
- i. Specially Trained Demonstrators.....
- j. Training Demonstrations.....
- k. Aggressors and Aggressor Materials.....
- l. Prisoner of War Interrogation Personnel.....

NOTE: Question No. 8 Indicates percentage responding "Yes".

	8-0	05-3	05-0	01-03	OWN	OUR	IN	AB	ADA	MA	CONUS	EUROPE
a. Actual Equipment.....	100	98	100	91	96		95	98	95	96	95	97
b. Models.....	67	59	36	49	48		52	53	39	43	46	56
c. Mockups.....	67	35	30	38	41		81	36	32	36	34	45
d. Graphic Materials.....	75	77	67	64	55		70	57	47	67	64	61
e. Displays.....	71	75	73	62	80		71	69	60	73	73	57
f. Chalkboards.....	91	91	99	90	93		93	91	87	92	91	96
g. Films.....	0	14	10	15	35		19	14	32	14	17	18
h. Sand Tables.....	100	52	48	53	56		67	57	33	28	50	80
i. Specially Trained Demonstrators.....	70	60	53	43	60		62	52	38	37	54	32
j. Training Demonstrations.....	73	71	74	62	76		75	61	66	66	67	53
k. Aggressors and Aggressor Materials.....	87	56	47	50	61		62	60	37	40	52	74
l. Prisoner of War Interrogation Personnel.....	40	25	16	12	38	HIGHER HEADQUARTERS	23	25	11	11	20	25
a. Actual Equipment.....	33	45	59	52	58		69	52	36	43	59	41
b. Models.....	100	96	69	64	80		76	75	62	60	69	74
c. Mockups.....	100	79	68	62	75		75	77	65	52	65	79
d. Graphic Materials.....	37	38	72	61	78		76	69	70	65	71	68
e. Displays.....	90	72	72	64	73		76	57	25	42	67	64
f. Chalkboards.....	100	50	38	46	49		51	75	70	56	96	42
g. Films.....	89	84	61	63	82		74	37	30	30	63	84
h. Sand Tables.....	75	54	37	31	47		44	59	44	52	38	29
i. Specially Trained Demonstrators.....	100	77	54	53	65		66	65	51	57	59	54
j. Training Demonstrations.....	100	78	63	56	68		88	75	64	65	64	66
k. Aggressors and Aggressor Materials.....	100	84	72	62	77		72	75	64	65	68	61
l. Prisoner of War Interrogation Personnel.....	100	23	59	57	68	CENTRAL TRAINING AREA	74	67	27	48	66	69
a. Actual Equipment.....	0	30	17	27	50		43	25	14	22	33	22
b. Models.....	25	66	78	52	70		73	65	35	58	73	37
c. Mockups.....	25	72	79	60	78		77	67	31	65	80	43
d. Graphic Materials.....	0	71	77	64	79		79	70	45	72	82	45
e. Displays.....	0	53	56	56	60		64	62	28	49	71	91
f. Chalkboards.....	0	32	40	34	47		49	39	19	36	48	25
g. Films.....	26	76	61	77	83		80	77	71	82	85	65
h. Sand Tables.....	67	35	41	29	63		59	49	25	37	47	25
i. Specially Trained Demonstrators.....	0	24	29	27	40		28	32	26	31	34	25
j. Training Demonstrations.....	0	24	27	34	29		30	29	23	35	34	32
k. Aggressors and Aggressor Materials.....	0	48	47	41	56		57	47	23	44	52	39
l. Prisoner of War Interrogation Personnel.....	0	20	23	17	41		27	20	4	21	24	32

ANIZATION USE THE FOLLOWING METHODS

SMALL UNIT TRAINING:

Post Exercises (CPX).....

then:

Conducted by.....

How often used.....

Training Exercise (FTX).....

then:

Conducted by.....

How often used.....

RECEIVE INSTRUCTION ON HOW TO TRAIN

IN: (Circle one response for each)

- Tools.....
- Commission Course.....
- Union Course (e.g., OCS, ROTC, USMA).....
- Course.....
- and Course.....

"Yes" to any part of Question #10, answer Question #11. Otherwise go
(12.)

THE INSTRUCTION I HAVE RECEIVED ON HOW TO TRAIN SMALL UNITS

- ely adequate information for the training of small units..4
- eful information but not completely adequate.....3
- ttle useful information.....2
- ul information.....1
- useful information" was circled, please write WHY you
this conclusion on the lines below.)

NOTE: Questions Nos. 9 & 10 indicate percentage responding "Yes".

3,3 3,0 2,9 2,8 3,1 3,0 2,9 2,8 2,9 3,9 2,0 3,0

OTHER
EUF PE
CON S
FA
ADA
AR
IN
B9
E7
03
01
3
04
5
CO
06
08
05
05
06
75 86 80 59 79 66 73 79 76 69 83 69

OWN RESOURCES
HIGHER HQ

YEARLY
EVERY 6 MONTHS
EVERY 3 MONTHS

OWN RESOURCES
HIGHER HQ

YEARLY
EVERY 6 MONTHS
EVERY 3 MONTHS

9. DID YOUR ORGANIZATION USE THE FOLLOWING METHODS
OF CONDUCTING SMALL UNIT TRAINING:
a. Command Post Exercises (CPX).....
If YES, then:

75 86 80 59 79 66 73 79 76
-06 -08 -05 -03 -01 03 05 07 09 11 13 15 17 19 21 23 25 27 29 31 33 35 37 39 41 43 45 47 49 51 53 55 57 59 61 63 65 67 69 71 73 75 77 79 81 83 85 87 89 91 93 95 97 99 101 103 105 107 109 111 113 115 117 119 121 123 125 127 129 131 133 135 137 139 141 143 145 147 149 151 153 155 157 159 161 163 165 167 169 171 173 175 177 179 181 183 185 187 189 191 193 195 197 199 201 203 205 207 209 211 213 215 217 219 221 223 225 227 229 231 233 235 237 239 241 243 245 247 249 251 253 255 257 259 261 263 265 267 269 271 273 275 277 279 281 283 285 287 289 291 293 295 297 299 301 303 305 307 309 311 313 315 317 319 321 323 325 327 329 331 333 335 337 339 341 343 345 347 349 351 353 355 357 359 361 363 365 367 369 371 373 375 377 379 381 383 385 387 389 391 393 395 397 399 401 403 405 407 409 411 413 415 417 419 421 423 425 427 429 431 433 435 437 439 441 443 445 447 449 451 453 455 457 459 461 463 465 467 469 471 473 475 477 479 481 483 485 487 489 491 493 495 497 499 501 503 505 507 509 511 513 515 517 519 521 523 525 527 529 531 533 535 537 539 541 543 545 547 549 551 553 555 557 559 561 563 565 567 569 571 573 575 577 579 581 583 585 587 589 591 593 595 597 599 601 603 605 607 609 611 613 615 617 619 621 623 625 627 629 631 633 635 637 639 641 643 645 647 649 651 653 655 657 659 661 663 665 667 669 671 673 675 677 679 681 683 685 687 689 691 693 695 697 699 701 703 705 707 709 711 713 715 717 719 721 723 725 727 729 731 733 735 737 739 741 743 745 747 749 751 753 755 757 759 761 763 765 767 769 771 773 775 777 779 781 783 785 787 789 791 793 795 797 799 801 803 805 807 809 811 813 815 817 819 821 823 825 827 829 831 833 835 837 839 841 843 845 847 849 851 853 855 857 859 861 863 865 867 869 871 873 875 877 879 881 883 885 887 889 891 893 895 897 899 901 903 905 907 909 911 913 915 917 919 921 923 925 927 929 931 933 935 937 939 941 943 945 947 949 951 953 955 957 959 961 963 965 967 969 971 973 975 977 979 981 983 985 987 989 991 993 995 997 999 1001 1003 1005 1007 1009 1011 1013 1015 1017 1019 1021 1023 1025 1027 1029 1031 1033 1035 1037 1039 1041 1043 1045 1047 1049 1051 1053 1055 1057 1059 1061 1063 1065 1067 1069 1071 1073 1075 1077 1079 1081 1083 1085 1087 1089 1091 1093 1095 1097 1099 1101 1103 1105 1107 1109 1111 1113 1115 1117 1119 1121 1123 1125 1127 1129 1131 1133 1135 1137 1139 1141 1143 1145 1147 1149 1151 1153 1155 1157 1159 1161 1163 1165 1167 1169 1171 1173 1175 1177 1179 1181 1183 1185 1187 1189 1191 1193 1195 1197 1199 1201 1203 1205 1207 1209 1211 1213 1215 1217 1219 1221 1223 1225 1227 1229 1231 1233 1235 1237 1239 1241 1243 1245 1247 1249 1251 1253 1255 1257 1259 1261 1263 1265 1267 1269 1271 1273 1275 1277 1279 1281 1283 1285 1287 1289 1291 1293 1295 1297 1299 1301 1303 1305 1307 1309 1311 1313 1315 1317 1319 1321 1323 1325 1327 1329 1331 1333 1335 1337 1339 1341 1343 1345 1347 1349 1351 1353 1355 1357 1359 1361 1363 1365 1367 1369 1371 1373 1375 1377 1379 1381 1383 1385 1387 1389 1391 1393 1395 1397 1399 1401 1403 1405 1407 1409 1411 1413 1415 1417 1419 1421 1423 1425 1427 1429 1431 1433 1435 1437 1439 1441 1443 1445 1447 1449 1451 1453 1455 1457 1459 1461 1463 1465 1467 1469 1471 1473 1475 1477 1479 1481 1483 1485 1487 1489 1491 1493 1495 1497 1499 1501 1503 1505 1507 1509 1511 1513 1515 1517 1519 1521 1523 1525 1527 1529 1531 1533 1535 1537 1539 1541 1543 1545 1547 1549 1551 1553 1555 1557 1559 1561 1563 1565 1567 1569 1571 1573 1575 1577 1579 1581 1583 1585 1587 1589 1591 1593 1595 1597 1599 1601 1603 1605 1607 1609 1611 1613 1615 1617 1619 1621 1623 1625 1627 1629 1631 1633 1635 1637 1639 1641 1643 1645 1647 1649 1651 1653 1655 1657 1659 1661 1663 1665 1667 1669 1671 1673 1675 1677 1679 1681 1683 1685 1687 1689 1691 1693 1695 1697 1699 1701 1703 1705 1707 1709 1711 1713 1715 1717 1719 1721 1723 1725 1727 1729 1731 1733 1735 1737 1739 1741 1743 1745 1747 1749 1751 1753 1755 1757 1759 1761 1763 1765 1767 1769 1771 1773 1775 1777 1779 1781 1783 1785 1787 1789 1791 1793 1795 1797 1799 1801 1803 1805 1807 1809 1811 1813 1815 1817 1819 1821 1823 1825 1827 1829 1831 1833 1835 1837 1839 1841 1843 1845 1847 1849 1851 1853 1855 1857 1859 1861 1863 1865 1867 1869 1871 1873 1875 1877 1879 1881 1883 1885 1887 1889 1891 1893 1895 1897 1899 1901 1903 1905 1907 1909 1911 1913 1915 1917 1919 1921 1923 1925 1927 1929 1931 1933 1935 1937 1939 1941 1943 1945 1947 1949 1951 1953 1955 1957 1959 1961 1963 1965 1967 1969 1971 1973 1975 1977 1979 1981 1983 1985 1987 1989 1991 1993 1995 1997 1999 2001 2003 2005 2007 2009 2011 2013 2015 2017 2019 2021 2023 2025 2027 2029 2031 2033 2035 2037 2039 2041 2043 2045 2047 2049 2051 2053 2055 2057 2059 2061 2063 2065 2067 2069 2071 2073 2075 2077 2079 2081 2083 2085 2087 2089 2091 2093 2095 2097 2099 2101 2103 2105 2107 2109 2111 2113 2115 2117 2119 2121 2123 2125 2127 2129 2131 2133 2135 2137 2139 2141 2143 2145 2147 2149 2151 2153 2155 2157 2159 2161 2163 2165 2167 2169 2171 2173 2175 2177 2179 2181 2183 2185 2187 2189 2191 2193 2195 2197 2199 2201 2203 2205 2207 2209 2211 2213 2215 2217 2219 2221 2223 2225 2227 2229 2231 2233 2235 2237 2239 2241 2243 2245 2247 2249 2251 2253 2255 2257 2259 2261 2263 2265 2267 2269 2271 2273 2275 2277 2279 2281 2283 2285 2287 2289 2291 2293 2295 2297 2299 2301 2303 2305 2307 2309 2311 2313 2315 2317 2319 2321 2323 2325 2327 2329 2331 2333 2335 2337 2339 2341 2343 2345 2347 2349 2351 2353 2355 2357 2359 2361 2363 2365 2367 2369 2371 2373 2375 2377 2379 2381 2383 2385 2387 2389 2391 2393 2395 2397 2399 2401 2403 2405 2407 2409 2411 2413 2415 2417 2419 2421 2423 2425 2427 2429 2431 2433 2435 2437 2439 2441 2443 2445 2447 2449 2451 2453 2455 2457 2459 2461 2463 2465 2467 2469 2471 2473 2475 2477 2479 2481 2483 2485 2487 2489 2491 2493 2495 2497 2499 2501 2503 2505 2507 2509 2511 2513 2515 2517 2519 2521 2523 2525 2527 2529 2531 2533 2535 2537 2539 2541 2543 2545 2547 2549 2551 2553 2555 2557 2559 2561 2563 2565 2567 2569 2571 2573 2575 2577 2579 2581 2583 2585 2587 2589 2591 2593 2595 2597 2599 2601 2603 2605 2607 2609 2611 2613 2615 2617 2619 2621 2623 2625 2627 2629 2631 2633 2635 2637 2639 2641 2643 2645 2647 2649 2651 2653 2655 2657 2659 2661 2663 2665 2667 2669 2671 2673 2675 2677 2679 2681 2683 2685 2687 2689 2691 2693 2695 2697 2699 2701 2703 2705 2707 2709 2711 2713 2715 2717 2719 2721 2723 2725 2727 2729 2731 2733 2735 2737 2739 2741 2743 2745 2747 2749 2751 2753 2755 2757 2759 2761 2763 2765 2767 2769 2771 2773 2775 2777 2779 2781 2783 2785 2787 2789 2791 2793 2795 2797 2799 2801 2803 2805 2807 2809 2811 2813 2815 2817 2819 2821 2823 2825 2827 2829 2831 2833 2835 2837 2839 2841 2843 2845 2847 2849 2851 2853 2855 2857 2859 2861 2863 2865 2867 2869 2871 2873 2875 2877 2879 2881 2883 2885 2887 2889 2891 2893 2895 2897 2899 2901 2903 2905 2907 2909 2911 2913 2915 2917 2919 2921 2923 2925 2927 2929 2931 2933 2935 2937 2939 2941 2943 2945 2947 2949 2951 2953 2955 2957 2959 2961 2963 2965 2967 2969 2971 2973 2975 2977 2979 2981 2983 2985 2987 2989 2991 2993 2995 2997 2999 3001 3003 3005 3007 3009 3011 3013 3015 3017 3019 3021 3023 3025 3027 3029 3031 3033 3035 3037 3039 3041 3043 3045 3047 3049 3051 3053 3055 3057 3059 3061 3063 3065 3067 3069 3071 3073 3075 3077 3079 3081 3083 3085 3087 3089 3091 3093 3095 3097 3099 3101 3103 3105 3107 3109 3111 3113 3115 3117 3119 3121 3123 3125 3127 3129 3131 3133 3135 3137 3139 3141 3143 3145 3147 3149 3151 3153 3155 3157 3159 3161 3163 3165 3167 3169 3171 3173 3175 3177 3179 3181 3183 3185 3187 3189 3191 3193 3195 3197 3199 3201 3203 3205 3207 3209 3211 3213 3215 3217 3219 3221 3223 3225 3227 3229 3231 3233 3235 3237 3239 3241 3243 3245 3247 3249 3251 3253 3255 3257 3259 3261 3263 3265 3267 3269 3271 3273 3275 3277 3279 3281 3283 3285 3287 3289 3291 3293 3295 3297 3299 3301 3303 3305 3307 3309 3311 3313 3315 3317 3319 3321 3323 3325 3327 3329 3331 3333 3335 3337 3339 3341 3343 3345 3347 3349 3351 3353 3355 3357 3359 3361 3363 3365 3367 3369 3371 3373 3375 3377 3379 3381 3383 3385 3387 3389 3391 3393 3395 3397 3399 3401 3403 3405 3407 3409 3411 3413 3415 3417 3419 3421 3423 3425 3427 3429 3431 3433 3435 3437 3439 3441 3443 3445 3447 3449 3451 3453 3455 3457 3459 3461 3463 3465 3467 3469 3471 3473 3475 3477 3479 3481 3483 3485 3487 3489 3491 3493 3495 3497 3499 3501 3503 3505 3507 3509 3511 3513 3515 3517 3519 3521 3523 3525 3527 3529 3531 3533 3535 3537 3539 3541 3543 3545 3547 3549 3551 3553 3555 3557 3559 3561 3563 3565 3567 3569 3571 3573 3575 3577 3579 3581 3583 3585 3587 3589 3591 3593 3595 3597 3599 3601 3603 3605 3607 3609 3611 3613 3615 3617 3619 3621 3623 3625 3627 3629 3631 3633 3635 3637 3639 3641 3643 3645 3647 3649 3651 3653 3655 3657 3659 3661 3663 3665 3667 3669 3671 3673 3675 3677 3679 3681 3683 3685 3687 3689 3691 3693 3695 3697 3699 3701 3703 3705 3707 3709 3711 3713 3715 3717 3719 3721 3723 3725 3727 3729 3731 3733 3735 3737 3739 3741 3743 3745 3747 3749 3751 3753 3755 3757 3759 3761 3763 3765 3767 3769 3771 3773 3775 3777 3779 3781 3783 3785 3787 3789 3791 3793 3795 3797 3799 3801 3803 3805 3807 3809 3811 3813 3815 3817 3819 3821 3823 3825 3827 3829 3831 3833 3835 3837 3839 3841 3843 3845 3847 3849 3851 3853 3855 3857 3859 3861 3863 3865 3867 3869 3871 3873 3875 3877 3879 3881 3883 3885 3887 3889 3891 3893 3895 3897 3899 3901 3903 3905 3907 3909 3911 3913 3915 3917 3919 3921 3923 3925 3927 3929 3931 3933 3935 3937 3939 3941 3943 3945 3947 3949 3951 3953 3955 3957 3959 3961 3963 3965 3967 3969 3971 3973 3975 3977 3979 3981 3983 3985 3987 3989 3991 3993 3995 3997 3999 4001 4003 4005 4007 4009 4011 4013 4015 4017 4019 4021 4023 4025 4027 4029 4031 4033 4035 4037 4039 4041 4043 4045 4047 4049 4051 4053 4055 4057 4059 4061 4063 4065 4067 4069 4071 4073 4075 4077 4079 4081 4083 4085 4087 4089 4091 4093 4095 4097 4099 4101 4103 4105 4107 4109 4111 4113 4115 4117 4119 4121 4123 4125 4127 4129 4131 4133 4135 4137 4139 4141 4143 4145 4147 4149 4151 4153 4155 4157 4159 4161 4163 4165 4167 4169 4171 4173 4175 4177 4179 4181 4183 4185 4187 4189 4191 4193 4195 4197 4199 4201 4203 4205 4207 4209 4211 4213 4215 4217 4219 4221 4223 4225 4227 4229 4231 4233 4235 4237 4239 4241 4243 4245 4247 4249 4251 4253 4255 4257 4259 4261 4263 4265 4267 4269 4271 4273 4275 4277 4279 4281 4283 4285 4287 4289 4291 4293 4295 4297 4299 4301 4303 4305 4307 4309 4311 4313 4315 4317 4319 4321 4323 4325 4327 4329 4331 4333 4335 4337 4339 4341 4343 4345 4347 4349 4351 4353 4355 4357 4359 4361 4363 4365 4367 4369 4371 4373 4375 4377 4379 4381 4383 4385 4387 4389 4391 4393 4395 4397 4399 4401 4403 4405 4407 4409 4411 4413 4415 4417 4419 4421 4423 4425 4427 4429 4431 4433 4435 4437 4439 4441 4443 4445 4447 4449 4451 4453 4455 4457 4459 4461 4463 4465 4467 4469 4471 4473 4475 4477 4479 4481 4483 4485 4487 4489 4491 4493 4495 4497 4499 4501 4503 4505 4507 4509 4511 4513 4515 4517 4519 4521 4523 4525 4527 4529 4531 4533 4535 4537 4539 4541 4543 4545 4547 4549 4551 4553 4555 4557 4559 4561 4563 4565 4567 4569 4571 4573 4575 4577 4579 4581 4583 4585 4587 4589 4591 4593 4595 4597 4599 4601 4603 4605 4607 4609 4611 4613 4615 4617 4619 4621 4623 4625 4627 4629 4631 4633 4635 4637 4639 4641 4643 4645 4647 4649 4651 4653 4655 4657 4659 4661 4663 4665 4667 4669 4671 4673 4675 4677 4679 4681 4683 4685 4687 4689 4691 4693 4695 4697 4699 4701 4703 4705 4707 4709 4711 4713 4715 4717 4719 4721 4723 4725 4727 4729 4731 4733 4735 4737 4739 4741 4743 4745 4747 4749 4751 4753 4755 4757 4759 4761 4763 4765 4767 4769 4771 4773 4775 4777 4779 4781 4783 4785 4787 4789 4791 4793 4795 4797 4799 4801 4803 4805 4807 4809 4811 4813 4815 4817 4819 4821 4823 4825 4827 4829 4831 4833 4835 4837 4839 4841 4843 4845 4847 4849 4851 4853 4855 4857 4859 4861 4863 4865 4867 4869 4871 4873 4875 4877 4879 4881 4883 4885 4887 4889 4891 4893 4895 4897 4899 4901 4903 4905 4907 4909 4911 4913 4915 4917 4919 4921 4923 4925 4927 4929 4931 4933 4935 4937 4939 4941 4943 4945 4947 4949 4951 4953 4955 4957 4959 4961 4963 4965 4967 4969 4971 4973 4975 4977 4979 4981 4983 4985 4987 4989 4991 4993 4995 4997 4999 5001 5003 5005 5007 5009 5011 5013 5015 5017 5019 5021 5023 5025 5027 5029 5031 5033 5035 5037 5039 5041 5043 5045 5047 5049 5051 5053 5055 5057 5059 5061 5063 5065 5067 5069 5071 5073 5075 5077 5079 5081 5083 5085 5087 5089 5091 5093 5095 5097 5099 5101 5103 5105 5107 5109 5111 5113 5115 5

	AGREE STRONGLY 4	AGREE SOMEWHAT 3	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT 2	DISAGREE STRONGLY 1
RECOMMEND THAT INSTRUCTION IN SMALL UNITS GIVEN IN SERVICE SCHOOLS/ Please indicate degree of agree- ment with each of the following)				
I remain about as it is.....	2.5	2.1	2.0	2.4
I include more instruction on use of expedients.....	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.5
I have more practical work by units on conducting small unit training.....	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.8
I offer more methods of instruction like those used in units.....	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5
RE SUGGESTIONS TO YOUR SENIORS ON HOW TRAINING COULD BE IMPROVED:				
ly one).....	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.6
QUESTIONS ARE GENERALLY:				
ed and implemented into training.....	4.4	4.4	4.7	4.2
ly accepted but rarely implemented.....				
ly rejected but are sometimes implemented later and never implemented.....				
make suggestions.....				
RE SUGGESTIONS TO YOUR SUBORDINATES ALL UNIT TRAINING COULD BE IMPROVED:				
ly one).....	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.5
QUESTIONS ARE GENERALLY:				
ed upon by imaginative subordinates.....				
out as you would have wanted.....				
out, but in an unimaginative fashion?				
es not carried out.....				
make suggestions.....				

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

06-08	05-03, Bn C	04, 05	01-03	E7-E9	A SERIOUS OBSTACLE 3	A MINOR OBSTACLE 2	NO PROBLEM 1	OTHER
2.1	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.4
2.1	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.2
2.4	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2
2.3	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.3
2.4	2.5	2.7	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.7	3.0	2.7
1.9	2.3	2.3	2.9	3.5	2.8	2.7	3.0	2.7
1.8	1.6	1.8	2.5	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.3
2.1	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.2	2.2	2.1
3.4	3.5	3.5	3.3	2.8	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.0
2.6	2.7	2.7	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.6	3.0	2.7
2.2	2.1	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.3
3.2	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.0
2.6	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.3
2.6	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.4
2.8	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.3	2.5

EXTENT IS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING AN
TO YOUR DEVELOPING INNOVATIVE AND
SMALL UNIT TRAINING:
one response for each of the following
of training in small unit training
niques.....
of expertise about specific subject
er (e.g., Weapons, Land Navigation)
of knowledge about what standards
performance to expect in small unit
ning.....
of familiarity with the techniques
field training in general, including
use of field expedients.....

EXTENT IS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING A
WHY THERE IS NOT MORE DYNAMIC TRAIN-
ARMY SMALL UNITS:
one response for each of the following)

efficient priority set by higher HQ..
ility to change because of the
dly prescribed Army training system.
of interest in change by immediate
ors.....
of interest in change by sub-
nates.....
onnel turbulence.....
of adequate budget.....
of knowledge about exactly what
ges to make.....
equate manning levels.....
of imagination among junior
onnel.....
equate motivation among junior
onnel.....
equate qualification of junior
onnel.....

2

17. TO WHAT EXTENT IS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING AN OBSTACLE TO YOUR DEVELOPING INNOVATIVE AND DYNAMIC SMALL UNIT TRAINING:

- (Circle one response for each of the following)
- a. Lack of training in small unit training techniques.....
- b. Lack of expertise about specific subject matter (e.g., Weapons, Land Navigation)
- c. Lack of knowledge about what standards of performance to expect in small unit training.....
- d. Lack of familiarity with the techniques of field training in general, including the use of field expedients.....

	06-08	05>3, Bn C	04, 05	A MAJOR OBSTACLE 4	A SERIOUS OBSTACLE 3			A MINOR OBSTACLE 2		NO PROBLEM 1
					IN	AD	ADA	MA	CONUS	
	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.2
	2.1	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.3
	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2
	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.4

18. TO WHAT EXTENT IS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING A REASON WHY THERE IS NOT MORE DYNAMIC TRAINING FOR ARMY SMALL UNITS:

- (Circle one response for each of the following)
- a. Insufficient priority set by higher HQ..
- b. Inability to change because of the rigidly prescribed Army training system.
- c. Lack of interest in change by immediate seniors.....
- d. Lack of interest in change by subordinates.....
- e. Personnel turbulence.....
- f. Lack of adequate budget.....
- g. Lack of knowledge about exactly what changes to make.....
- h. Inadequate manning levels.....
- i. Lack of imagination among junior personnel.....
- j. Inadequate motivation among junior personnel.....
- k. Inadequate qualification of junior personnel.....

	2.4	1.9	1.8	2.1	3.4	2.6	A MAJOR CAUSE 4			A SERIOUS CAUSE 3			A MINOR CAUSE 2		NOT A FACTOR 1
							2.7	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.8	
	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.9	3.5	2.2	2.5	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.6	3.0
	1.8	1.6	1.8	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.4	2.0	2.1	2.6
	2.1	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.7	2.3	2.0	2.2
	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.3	2.8	2.8	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.3
	2.6	2.7	2.7	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.7	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.6	2.9	2.9	3.0
	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.3
	3.2	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.1
	2.6	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.3
	2.6	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.3	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.2
	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.3

06-08	05-03	04-05	01-03	E7-E9	IN	AR	ADA	FA	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
6	10	15	17	16	16	17	12	15	16	15	16
6	7	15	26	15	23	17	19	13	17	23	23
12	0	1	8	6	7	6	8	3	5	8	7
0	0	0	1	2	0.5	1	2	1	1	2	2
38	46	32	22	16	20	32	17	28	28	14	17
0	5	6	11	10	12	8	5	8	9	14	8
6	3	8	4	7	5	3	7	5	5	6	5
12	20	9	4	11	6	8	12	11	8	9	9
12	5	5	1	3	3	1	0	3	3	0	3
0	2	4	4	4	3	3	7	5	3	4	5
6	3	6	2	10	4	4	10	6	7	4	4

THE FOLLOWING IS THE SINGLE MOST SERIOUS REASON WHY
MORE DYNAMIC TRAINING FOR ARMY SMALL UNITS:

1. sufficient priority set by higher HQ.....
2. tendency to change because of the rigidly prescribed
3. training system.....
4. interest in change by immediate seniors.....
5. interest in change by subordinates.....
6. internal turbulence.....
7. adequate budget.....
8. knowledge about exactly what changes to make.....
9. adequate manning levels.....
10. imagination among junior personnel.....
11. adequate motivation among junior personnel.....
12. adequate qualification of junior personnel.....

13. THE CAN SMALL UNIT TRAINING BE IMPROVED BY HAVING THE
14. OR TRAINING SUPERVISOR) SHOW A GREAT DEAL OF ENERGY,
15. AND LEADERSHIP WHEN SUCH TRAINING IS BEING CONDUCTED:

1. significantly.....
2. for degree.....
3. moderate degree.....
4. minor degree.....
5. all.....

6. IF YOU TO PROVIDE THIS LEADERSHIP, ENERGY, AND ENTHUSIASM
7. TRAINING IS TO BE CONDUCTED IN YOUR UNIT:

1. prohibits me from doing so.....
2. re occasional times when I cannot do so.....
3. re many times when other responsibilities prohibit
4. doing so.....
5. the time, other responsibilities prohibit me from
6. 0.....

7. THE CAN SMALL UNIT TRAINING BE IMPROVED BY HAVING THE
8. OR TRAINING SUPERVISOR) SHOW A GREAT DEAL OF ENERGY,
9. AND LEADERSHIP WHEN SUCH TRAINING IS BEING PLANNED:

1. significantly.....
2. for degree.....
3. moderate degree.....
4. minor degree.....
5. all.....

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

4.6	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.3
2.8	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.4	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6
4.4	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.4

NOTE: Question No. 19 indicates percentage responding w/this answer.

19. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING IS THE SINGLE MOST SERIOUS REASON WHY THERE IS NOT MORE DYNAMIC TRAINING FOR ARMY SMALL UNITS:

- a. Insufficient priority set by higher HQ.....
- b. Inability to change because of the rigidly prescribed Army training system.....
- c. Lack of interest in change by immediate seniors.....
- d. Lack of interest in change by subordinates.....
- e. Personnel turbulence.....
- f. Lack of adequate budget.....
- g. Lack of knowledge about exactly what changes to make.....
- h. Inadequate manning levels.....
- i. Lack of imagination among junior personnel.....
- j. Inadequate motivation among junior personnel.....
- k. Inadequate qualification of junior personnel.....

	06-08	05-03	04-05	01-03	E7-E9	IN	AR	ADA	FA
a.	6	10	15	17	16	16	17	12	15
b.	6	7	15	26	15	23	17	19	13
c.	12	0	1	8	2	7	6	8	3
d.	38	46	32	22	16	25	1	2	1
e.	0	5	6	11	10	12	32	17	28
f.	6	3	8	4	7	5	8	5	5
g.	12	20	9	4	11	6	3	12	11
h.	12	5	5	1	3	3	8	0	3
i.	6	3	4	4	4	3	3	7	5
j.	6	3	6	2	10	4	4	10	6
k.									

20. TO WHAT EXTENT CAN SMALL UNIT TRAINING BE IMPROVED BY HAVING THE COMMANDER (OR TRAINING SUPERVISOR) SHOW A GREAT DEAL OF ENERGY, ENTHUSIASM, AND LEADERSHIP WHEN SUCH TRAINING IS BEING CONDUCTED:

- a. Very significantly.....5
- b. To a major degree.....4
- c. To a moderate degree.....3
- d. To a minor degree.....2
- e. Not at all.....1

a.	4.6	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.1
----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

21. HOW FREE ARE YOU TO PROVIDE THIS LEADERSHIP, ENERGY, AND ENTHUSIASM WHEN SUCH TRAINING IS TO BE CONDUCTED IN YOUR UNIT:

- a. Nothing prohibits me from doing so.....4
- b. There are occasional times when I cannot do so.....3
- c. There are many times when other responsibilities prohibit me from doing so.....2
- d. Most of the time, other responsibilities prohibit me from doing so.....1

a.	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.4	2.6
----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

22. TO WHAT EXTENT CAN SMALL UNIT TRAINING BE IMPROVED BY HAVING THE COMMANDER (OR TRAINING SUPERVISOR) SHOW A GREAT DEAL OF ENERGY, ENTHUSIASM, AND LEADERSHIP WHEN SUCH TRAINING IS BEING PLANNED:

- a. Very significantly.....5
- b. To a major degree.....4
- c. To a moderate degree.....3
- d. To a minor degree.....2
- e. Not at all.....1

a.	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.2
----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

NOTE: Question No. 19 indicates percentage responding w/thi

06-08	05-03, B	04, 05	01-03	E7-E9	IN	AR	ADA	PA	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
3.0	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.6	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.8
100	92	91	85	83	88	90	69	85	85	88	87
1.7	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.4	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.2
1.9	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.1

ARE YOU TO PROVIDE THIS LEADERSHIP, ENERGY, AND ENTHUSIASM
WHICH TRAINING IS BEING PLANNED IN YOUR UNIT:

1. Training prohibits me from doing so.....4
2. There are occasional times when I cannot do so.....3
3. There are many times when other responsibilities prohibit
me from doing so.....2
4. Most of the time, other responsibilities prohibit me from
doing so.....1

DO YOU PERSONALLY HAVE TO CONDUCT SMALL UNIT TRAINING OUTSIDE OF
ESTABLISHED SCHOOL/CENTER USING FEW ASSISTANTS, LIMITED FACILITIES
RESOURCES, AND RELYING HEAVILY ON FIELD EXPEDIENTS:.....

DO YOU VIEW THE CONDUCT OF SMALL UNIT TRAINING OUTSIDE OF
ESTABLISHED SCHOOL/CENTER USING FEW ASSISTANTS AND LIMITED
RESOURCES:

1. Possible to conduct adequate training in such a context.....4
2. Adequate training can be conducted only with very great
difficulty.....3
3. Adequate training can be conducted with minor difficulty.....2
4. Problem. Training qualitatively comparable to that given
a school/center can be conducted with no difficulty, if the
commander has initiative and resourcefulness.....1

DO YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT THE FORMAL WRITTEN SMALL UNIT TRAINING
BE SUPPLIED BY DA (E.G., ATP'S, ARMY SUBJECT SCHEDULES,
G CIRCULARS, ETC.):

1. They are very valuable and should always be used as a
reference when conducting training.....3
2. They are valuable as general guidance but not always that
ful when training is being conducted.....2
3. They are of little value in that they do not take into
consideration important local factors.....1

Item No. 24 indicates percentage responding "Yes".

06-08 05-03, Bn CO 04, 05 01-03 E7-E9 IN AR ADA FA CONUS EUROPE

23. HOW FREE ARE YOU TO PROVIDE THIS LEADERSHIP, ENERGY, AND ENTHUSIASM WHEN SUCH TRAINING IS BEING PLANNED IN YOUR UNIT:
- a. Nothing prohibits me from doing so.....4
 - b. There are occasional times when I cannot do so.....3
 - c. There are many times when other responsibilities prohibit me from doing so.....2
 - d. Most of the time, other responsibilities prohibit me from doing so.....1
24. HAVE YOU EVER PERSONALLY HAD TO CONDUCT SMALL UNIT TRAINING OUTSIDE OF AN ESTABLISHED SCHOOL/CENTER USING FEW ASSISTANTS, LIMITED FACILITIES AND RESOURCES, AND RELYING HEAVILY ON FIELD EXPEDIENTS:.....
25. HOW DO YOU VIEW THE CONDUCT OF SMALL UNIT TRAINING OUTSIDE OF AN ESTABLISHED SCHOOL/CENTER USING FEW ASSISTANTS AND LIMITED FACILITIES AND RESOURCES:
- a. Impossible to conduct adequate training in such a context.....4
 - b. Adequate training can be conducted only with very great difficulty.....3
 - c. Adequate training can be conducted with minor difficulty.....2
 - d. No problem. Training qualitatively comparable to that given in a school/center can be conducted with no difficulty, if the commander has initiative and resourcefulness.....1
26. WHAT ARE YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT THE FORMAL WRITTEN SMALL UNIT TRAINING GUIDANCE SUPPLIED BY DA (E.G., ATP'S, ARMY SUBJECT SCHEDULES, TRAINING CIRCULARS, ETC.):
- a. They are very valuable and should always be used as a reference when conducting training.....3
 - b. They are valuable as general guidance but not always that useful when training is being conducted.....2
 - c. They are of little value in that they do not take into consideration important local factors.....1

NOTE: Question No. 24 indicates percentage responding "Yes".

ENTER ONE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING
IN ARMY SMALL UNIT
Give one response for each
actors from higher levels of
and will note deviation from
training guidance and react
tively.....
each subject matter must be presented
limited amount of time that it is
possible to accomplish anything
erent from that which is prescribed
NCO's and Junior Officers who present
ning are unused to thinking for them-
es and thus they do not develop any
vative techniques on their own.....
trainers and commanders are unaware
they are authorized to take new
coaches and use "way out" techniques
raining.....
r (write in)

YOU CONSIDER TO BE A MINIMUM PLATOON "PRESENT
" STRENGTH TO ACHIEVE DYNAMIC PLT. TRAINING?
answer in terms of TOE strength, not
strength.).....

tion No. 28 responses are in percentages.

	06-08	05-03, Bn CO	04, 05-03	01-03	E7-E9	IN	AR	ADA	FA	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
06-08	2.2	2.6	2.5	3.1	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.8
05-03, Bn CO	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.8	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.9	2.6
04, 05-03	2.9	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.4
01-03	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.4
E7-E9	65	84	64	66	68	88	70	53	87	67	54	71
06-08	72	-	77	72	78	85	70	75	-	76	72	93
05-03, Bn CO	75	69	78	74	80	67	70	78	65	82	76	89
04, 05-03	76	79	79	77	77	76	81	78	81	83	80	82
01-03	76	79	75	73	74	77	78	72	82	69	70	70
E7-E9	76	79	75	73	74	77	78	72	82	69	70	70

	06-08	05-03, Bn CO	04, 05-03	01-03	E7-E9	IN	AR	ADA	FA	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
06-08	65	84	64	66	68	88	70	53	87	67	54	71
05-03, Bn CO	72	-	77	72	78	85	70	75	-	76	72	93
04, 05-03	75	69	78	74	80	67	70	78	65	82	76	89
01-03	76	79	79	77	77	76	81	78	81	83	80	82
E7-E9	76	79	75	73	74	77	78	72	82	69	70	70

27. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES EACH OF THE FOLLOWING

REDUCE INNOVATION IN ARMY SMALL UNIT TRAINING: (Circle one response for each)

- a. Inspectors from higher levels of command will note deviation from their training guidance and react negatively.....
- b. So much subject matter must be presented in a limited amount of time that it is not possible to accomplish anything different from that which is prescribed
- c. Many NCO's and Junior Officers who present training are unused to thinking for themselves and thus they do not develop any innovative techniques on their own.....
- d. Many trainers and commanders are unaware that they are authorized to take new approaches and use "way out" techniques in training.....
- e. Other (write in) _____

	06-08	05-03, Bn CO	04, 05-03	01-03	E7-E9	IN	AR	ADA	FA	CONUS
a.	2.2	2.6	2.5	3.1	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.8
b.	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.8	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.5
c.	2.9	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5
d.	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.4

28. WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE A MINIMUM PLATOON "PRESENT FOR DUTY" STRENGTH TO ACHIEVE DYNAMIC PLT. TRAINING? (Please answer in terms of TOE strength, not assigned strength.).....

	06-08	05-03, Bn CO	04-03	01-03	E7-E9	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
a.	65	84	64	66	68	68	87	67
b.	72	-	77	72	78	85	-	76
c.	75	69	78	74	80	67	65	82
d.	76	79	79	77	77	76	81	83
e.	76	79	75	73	74	77	82	69

NOTE: Question No. 28 responses are in percentages.

CONSIDER TO BE A MINIMUM COMPANY "PRESENT
STRENGTH TO ACHIEVE DYNAMIC CO. TRAINING?
er in terms of TOE strength, not
length.)

DATE	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
06-08	72	79	68
05-20	72	-	78
05-13	75	71	78
01-03	77	80	80
E7-E9	79	78	77

IN	AR	ADA	FA
69	73	80	75
73	77	88	72
74	79	79	76
77	78	77	79
77	77	81	82

CONUS	62	74	77	79	73
EUROPE	84	-	75	80	73
OTHER	63	78	81	82	70

IN	AR	ADA	FA
609	71	82	80
75	78	80	74
77	81	82	78
80	80	75	80
70	70	74	74

CONSIDER TO BE A MINIMUM BATTALION
DUTY" STRENGTH TO ACHIEVE DYNAMIC BN.
lease answer in terms of TOE
t assigned strength.).....

68	77	70	71	66	75	78
74	-	78	75	76	88	73
75	70	78	75	75	76	75
77	80	82	77	78	73	80
79	79	80	80	77	80	79

71	82	64
76	-	78
78	76	80
78	81	79
76	81	72

64 77 75 75
77 80 80 73
80 79 81 75
79 82 67 79
74 73 76 76

29. WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE A MINIMUM COMPANY "PRESENT FOR DUTY" STRENGTH TO ACHIEVE DYNAMIC CO. TRAINING? (Please answer in terms of TOE strength, not assigned strength.)

	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER	IN	AR	ADA	FA	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER	IN
06-08	72	79	68	69	73	80	75	62	84	63	60
85-86	72	-	78	73	77	88	72	74	-	78	75
87-88	75	71	78	74	79	79	76	77	75	81	77
01-03	77	80	80	77	78	77	79	79	80	82	80
E7-E9	79	78	77	77	77	81	78	73	73	70	70

71	66	75	78	71	82	64	64
75	76	88	73	76	-	78	77
75	75	76	75	78	76	80	80
77	78	73	80	81	79	79	79
80	77	80	79	76	81	72	74

30. WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE A MINIMUM BATTALION "PRESENT FOR DUTY" STRENGTH TO ACHIEVE DYNAMIC BN. TRAINING? (Please answer in terms of TOE strength, not assigned strength.)

68	77	70	68	77	70
74	-	78	74	-	78
75	70	78	75	76	75
77	80	82	77	78	73
79	79	80	79	77	80

NOTE: Questions Nos. 29 & 30 - responses are in percentages.

CONSIDER TO BE A MAXIMUM "DEADLINE" STRENGTH OF A
 TLES THAT WILL STILL ALLOW DYNAMIC TRAINING TO BE

- | | |
|----|-----|
| 1. | 0% |
| 2. | 5% |
| 3. | 10% |
| 4. | 15% |
| 5. | 20% |
| 6. | 25% |
| 7. | 30% |
| 8. | 35% |
| 9. | 40% |

DO SAFETY RESTRICTIONS HAVE ON A UNIT'S ABILITY TO CONDUCT DYNAMIC

all.....	3
endurance to training.....	2
endurance to training.....	1

the Chief of Staff of the Army directed that all detailed training be decentralized to battalion and lower level, that mandatory subjects higher headquarters be eliminated, and that training guidance be provided by mission-type instructions rather than detailed directives. Individual training records will no longer be required.

WARD OF THIS DIRECTIVE BEFORE RECEIVING THE PRESENT SURVEY?

to Question 33 is "Yes," answer Question 34; if "No," go on to

HAS THIS DIRECTIVE HAD ON THE TRAINING OF YOUR UNIT?

significant effect.....	3
effect.....	2
ect at all.....	1

YOUR EXPERIENCE, DO YOU THINK THAT THIS DIRECTIVE WILL
BE "DYNAMIC TRAINING" IN YOUR UNIT? (Circle response
closest to your evaluation.)

4. closest to your evaluation)
3. have favorable impact immediately (within 3 months)...
2. help significantly but it will take time for the
1. to adjust (improvement after 3 months).....
0. not believe decentralization will necessarily lead to
- 1. training but it might help a little.....
- 2. decentralizing responsibility won't help at all.....

Question No. 31 indicates percentage responding w/this answer. Question No. 33 indicates percentage responding "Yes".

06-08	00.3	BnCO	00.3	01-	00-	Eg	IN	A	A 1	FA	CO-	Ns	E-	ROPE	0-H	EX
0	0	0	0	2	3	2	2	1	3	2	2			1	2	
31	0	0	17	11	29	16	16	17	21	23	16			11	22	
31	27	0	32	29	29	26	26	31	26	30	29			31	31	
6	24	0	16	14	11	13	13	17	12	15	14			20	13	
0	17	0	16	17	13	16	16	17	17	17	19			19	14	
12	10	0	12	12	5	10	10	11	8	7	10			11	7	
0	8	0	2	5	2	5	5	1	4	4	5			1	3	
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1			0	1	
6	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	5	6	3	5			5	6	

2.1	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.1
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDG

100	97	94	72	73	13	86	61	83	80	81	70
-----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Year	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Population (millions)	7.8	8.1	8.4	8.7	9.0	9.3	9.6	9.9	10.2	10.5	10.8	11.1	11.4	11.7
GDP (trillion USD)	1.2	1.5	1.8	2.1	2.4	2.7	3.0	3.3	3.6	3.9	4.2	4.5	4.8	5.1
Urban population (%)	55	58	61	64	67	70	73	76	79	82	85	88	91	94
Life expectancy (years)	72	74	76	78	80	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98
Renewable energy share (%)	10	12	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36

	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.0.
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

31. WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE A MAXIMUM "DEADLINE" STRENGTH OF A UNIT'S VEHICLES THAT WILL STILL ALLOW DYNAMIC TRAINING TO BE ACHIEVED?

1. 0%
2. 5%
3. 10%
4. 15%
5. 20%
6. 25%
7. 30%
8. 35%
9. 40%

32. WHAT IMPACT DO SAFETY RESTRICTIONS HAVE ON A UNIT'S ABILITY TO CONDUCT DYNAMIC TRAINING? 3

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| TRAINING? | 3 |
| a. None at all..... | 2 |
| b. Some hindrance to training..... | 1 |
| c. Great hindrance to training..... | 1 |

On 30 June 1971, the Chief of Staff of the Army directed that all detailed training management be decentralized to battalion and lower level, that mandatory subjects prescribed by higher headquarters be eliminated, and that training guidance be provided to battalions by mission-type instructions rather than detailed directives. Also, that individual training records will no longer be required.

23 HAD YOU HEARD OF THIS DIRECTIVE BEFORE RECEIVING THE PRESENT SURVEY?

(If your answer to Question 33 is "Yes," answer Question 34; if "No," go on to Question 35.)

Question 33.7

34. WHAT EFFECT HAS THIS DIRECTIVE HAD ON THE TRAINING OF YOUR UNIT?

- WHAT EFFECT HAS THIS DIRECTIVE HAD ON THE TRAINING OF TOUR GUIDES?
- | | |
|------------------------------|----|
| a. A significant effect..... | 3. |
| b. Some effect..... | 2. |
| c. No effect at all..... | 1. |

35. BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCE, DO YOU THINK THAT THIS DIRECTIVE WILL LEAD TO MORE "DYNAMIC TRAINING" IN YOUR UNIT? (Circle response that comes closest to your evaluation.)

- a. Should have favorable impact immediately (within 3 months)....4.
- b. Should help significantly but it will take time for the system to adjust (improvement after 3 months).....3.
- c. I do not believe decentralization will necessarily lead to dynamic training but it might help a little.....2.
- d. Decentralizing responsibility won't help at all.....1.

NOTE. Question No. 31 indicates percentage responding w/this answer. Question No. 33 indicates percentage responding

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO

06-08	003	BNC0	003	01-0	E	E9	IN	A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	FA
0	0	0	0	2	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	4	5	6	7	8	9	2
31	27	8	17	11	29	29	16	17	21	30	23	4	0	4	7	0	1	2
31	24	24	32	24	29	29	26	31	26	30	23	4	0	4	7	0	1	2
6	0	17	16	14	11	13	13	17	12	15	17	7	1	1	7	1	1	2
0	17	16	12	12	5	5	10	11	8	17	17	7	1	1	7	1	1	2
12	10	17	12	5	2	2	5	1	4	11	11	7	1	1	7	1	1	2
0	8	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	7	0	0	2
9	9	5	0	5	0	6	6	5	6	6	6	4	5	6	7	0	0	2
9	9	5	0	5	0	6	6	5	6	6	6	4	5	6	7	0	0	2

[illegible]

100	97	94	77	73	13	86	61	83
100	97	94	77	73	13	86	61	83

	17.7	2.1	2.3	4.2	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.1	2.0
1986	1.7	2.1	2.3	4.2	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.1	2.0

	7.8	79	3A	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.8	3.0	3.
--	-----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

ED EITHER "2" OR "1" ABOVE, WHAT DO YOU THINK THE CHIEF OF STAFF SHOULD
E DYNAMIC TRAINING? (Write in)

IN THE ARMY CONDUCT SMALL UNIT TRAINING THAT IS CALLED
TRAINING." ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THIS TYPE OF TRAINING?

to Question 37 is "Yes," answer Question 38; if "No," go on to

R OPINION OF "ADVENTURE TRAINING" AS A MEANS OF TRAIN-
R UNIT?

nt.....4.
.....3.
.....2.
.....1.
is not equipped to conduct such training.....1.

SPECIAL FORCES TEAM REENACTED THE LEWIS AND CLARK
BY MARCHING AND BOATING ACROSS THE WESTERN PORTION
ED STATES. DO YOU THINK YOUR UNIT WOULD BE INTER-
IS TYPE OF TRAINING PROJECT?.....

to Question 39 is "Yes," answer Question 40; if "No," go on to

K YOUR UNIT IS CAPABLE OF CONDUCTING SUCH AN EXPEDITION?
ause of lack of training and equipment for this type 3
ation.....2.
, if provided special training and equipment.....1.
.....1.

RIBE IN DETAIL BELOW ANY KIND OF "ADVENTURE TRAINING" THAT HAS BEEN UNDER-
UR UNIT AND THE RESULTS.

tions No. 37 and 39 indicate percentage responding "Yes".

06-08 79 82 71 57 48 72 55 24 47 61 51 55
053, Bn CO 04, 053 01-03 E7-E9 IN AR ADA FA CONUS EUROPE OTHER

2.6 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.3 3.5 3.1 2.8 3.1 3.4 3.5 3.2

38 77 73 80 58 84 69 40 61 74 75 64

2.1 1.9 1.7 1.8 2.0 1.7 2.0 2.1 2.0 1.8 2.0 1.9

NOTE: Questions Nos. 36 & 39 indicates percentage
responding "Yes".

2

36. IF YOU CIRCLED EITHER "2" OR "1" ABOVE, WHAT DO YOU THINK THE CHIEF OF STAFF SHOULD DO TO PROMOTE DYNAMIC TRAINING? (Write in)

37. SOME UNITS IN THE ARMY CONDUCT SMALL UNIT TRAINING THAT IS CALLED "ADVENTURE TRAINING." ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THIS TYPE OF TRAINING?

(If your answer to Question 37 is "Yes," answer Question 38; if "No," go on to Question 39.)

38. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF "ADVENTURE TRAINING" AS A MEANS OF TRAINING FOR YOUR UNIT?

- Excellent.....4.
- Good.....3.
- Poor.....2.
- My unit is not equipped to conduct such training.....1.

39. RECENTLY A SPECIAL FORCES TEAM REENACTED THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION BY MARCHING AND BOATING ACROSS THE WESTERN PORTION OF THE UNITED STATES. DO YOU THINK YOUR UNIT WOULD BE INTERESTED IN THIS TYPE OF TRAINING PROJECT?.....

(If your answer to Question 39 is "Yes," answer Question 40; if "No," go on to Question 41.)

40. DO YOU THINK YOUR UNIT IS CAPABLE OF CONDUCTING SUCH AN EXPEDITION?

- No, because of lack of training and equipment for this type of operation.....3.
- Perhaps, if provided special training and equipment.....2.
- Yes.....1.

41. PLEASE DESCRIBE IN DETAIL BELOW ANY KIND OF "ADVENTURE TRAINING" THAT HAS BEEN UNDERTAKEN BY YOUR UNIT AND THE RESULTS.

NOTE: Questions No. 37 and 39 indicate percentage responding "Yes".

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

06-08	79	82	71	57	48	72	55	24	41
05-3, Bn CO									
04, 05-3									
01-03									
E7-E9									
IN									
AR									
ADA									
EA									

2.6	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.1	2.8	3.1	2.1
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

38	77	73	80	58	84	69	40	61	2.1
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

2.1	1.9	1.7	1.8	2.0	1.7	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.1
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

NOTE: Questions Nos. 36 & 39 indicates responding "Yes".

IT, WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATE OF TRAINING FOLLOWING SUBJECT AREAS: (Circle one response)									

42. IN YOUR UNIT, WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATE OF TRAINING IN THE FOLLOWING SUBJECT AREAS: (Circle one response for each)

- a. Tactics.....
- b. Weapons.....
- c. Support.....
- d. Maintenance.....
- e. Communication.....

43. IN YOUR UNIT, WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATE OF TRAINING IN THE FOLLOWING GENERAL AREAS: (Circle one response for each)

- a. Operational Readiness Training.....
- b. Unit Training.....
- c. Individual Training.....

44. IF POSSIBLE, PLEASE DESCRIBE A SITUATION IN WHICH YOU DEVELOPED AND PRESENTED AN INNOVATION IN SMALL UNIT TRAINING USING LIMITED FACILITIES AND RESOURCES. LIST ANY APPROPRIATE DOCUMENTS USED TO ASSIST YOU IN DEVELOPING THE TRAINING.

Read again what we mean by "Dynamic Training":

- **Training tailored-to-need from the commander's own appraisal of his unit and his soldiers.
- **Training which meets need despite constraints, so that training progresses toward the commander's goals even if he is hampered by reduced strength, limited training facilities, or other scarce resources.
- **Training in which input by the trainer (instructor) is imaginative, innovative, professionally stretching.
- **Training in which the output for the trainee (student) is job-satisfaction--a zestful, stimulating, rewarding learning experience.

45. TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE THE TRAINING IN YOUR UNIT AS "DYNAMIC" AS WE USE THE TERM?

- a. Rarely, if ever.....4
- b. A few times.....3
- c. Frequently.....2
- d. Almost always.....1

2.4 2.7 2.7 2.9 2.9 2.8 2.9 2.9 2.8 2.8

	06-08	05-07	04-05	01-03	E7-E9	IN	ADEQUATE		FA	CONUS	EUROPE
							2	1			
a. Tactics.....	2.0	1.8	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.8	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.0
b. Weapons.....	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.1
c. Support.....	2.1	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.9	1.8
d. Maintenance.....	1.9	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.0	2.0	2.0
e. Communication.....	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.8	1.9	2.0	1.9	1.9

	06-08	05-07	04-05	01-03	E7-E9	IN	ADEQUATE		FA	CONUS	EUROPE
							2	1			
a. Operational Readiness Training.....	2.3	1.8	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.8	2.4	2.1	1.9	2.2
b. Unit Training.....	2.1	1.7	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.7	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0
c. Individual Training.....	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDG

Listed below are a number of missions or problem areas a typical unit might have to deal with in a three month period. Please:

1. First, look at the list and then add any problem areas or missions which your unit faces which are not included on the list. Please add these using the blank spaces at the end of the present list.
2. Second, use the first column (Column A) to indicate on the 5 point scale given below the importance you believe your superiors attach to these missions/problems.
3. Third, use Column B to indicate the importance that you believe should be attached to these missions/problems.
4. Fourth, use Column C to indicate how much of your time and attention is required by the mission/problem.
5. Finally, use Column D to indicate what percentage of the total effort of your unit was allocated over a three month period to each mission/problem.
NOTE: Column D should add up to 100%.

USE THIS SCALE FOR COLUMNS A, B, C, ONLY (Enter Number Only)

5	4	3	2	1
Most Demanding/Important	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Least Demanding/Important

2

Listed below are a number of missions or problem areas a typical unit might have to deal with in a three month period. Please:

1. First, look at the list and then add any problem areas or missions which your unit faces which are not included on the list. Please add these using the blank spaces at the end of the present list.
2. Second, use the first column (Column A) to indicate on the 5 point scale given below the importance you believe your superiors attach to these missions/problems.
3. Third, use Column B to indicate the importance that you believe should be attached to these missions/problems.
4. Fourth, use Column C to indicate how much of your time and attention is required by the mission/problem.
5. Finally, use Column D to indicate what percentage of the total effort of your unit was allocated over a three month period to each mission/problem.
NOTE: Column D should add up to 100%.

USE THIS SCALE FOR COLUMNS A, B, C, ONLY (Enter Number Only)

5	4	3	2	1
Most Demanding/Important	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Least Demanding/Important

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDG

If you would be willing to talk about your own ideas concerning training to a member of the Board for Dynamic Training, please DETACH THIS SHEET so that your name cannot be associated with your previous responses, FILL IN THE INFORMATION BELOW, and GIVE THIS SHEET SEPARATELY TO THE SURVEY TEAM OR SEND IT TO THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS.

Board for Dynamic Training
Fort Benning
Georgia 31905

Your Name and Grade _____

Mailing Address _____

Duty Telephone _____

Please enter below any additional comments you would like to make.

2

If you would be willing to talk about your own ideas concerning training to a member of the Board for Dynamic Training, please DETACH THIS SHEET so that your name cannot be associated with your previous responses, FILL IN THE INFORMATION BELOW, and GIVE THIS SHEET SEPARATELY TO THE SURVEY TEAM OR SEND IT TO THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS.

Board for Dynamic Training
Fort Benning
Georgia 31905

Your Name and Grade _____

Mailing Address _____

Duty Telephone _____

Please enter below any additional comments you would like to make.

AD-A056 848

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION ALEXANDRIA VA
ANALYSIS OF TRAINING MANAGEMENT SURVEY.(U)

F/G 5/9

OCT 71 T O JACOBS, J A SALTER, C I CHRISTIE

DAHC19-70-C-0012

UNCLASSIFIED

HUMRRO-CR-D4-71-33

NL

2 OF 2
ADA
056848



END
DATE
FILMED

9-78

DDC

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDG

How Important/Demanding To Your Seniors

Area	06-08	05>3, Bn CO	04, 05<3	01-03	E7-E9	IN	AR	ADA	FA	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
Abuse Control	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.9
Community Relations	3.2	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.3	3.1	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.1
Relations	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.9
Unit Training	2.8	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.7
Stand Sections	2.4	3.0	3.4	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.5	4.0	3.5
International Relations	3.5	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.2
Medical Maintenance	3.4	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.8	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.0
Administration	3.0	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.6

2

[illegible]

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDG

How Important/Demanding In Your View

or Area	06-08	05-03, Bn CO	04, 05-03	E7-E9	IN	AR	ADA	FA	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
Abuse Control	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.8
Community Relations	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.6	3.0	2.6	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.9
Relations	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.9	3.7
Unit Training	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.2
Command Inspections	2.8	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0
International Relations	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.5
Miscellaneous Maintenance	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.0
Administration	3.1	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.4

Mission or Problem Area	06-08	05>3, Bn CO	04, 05<3	01-03	E7-B9
1. Drug Abuse Control	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.7
2. Community Relations	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.6	3.0
3. Race Relations	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.5
4. Small Unit Training	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2
5. Command Inspections	2.8	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.2
6. Operational Missions	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.3
7. Vehicular Maintenance	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.0
8. Administration	3.1	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.8
9. _____					
10. _____					

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

How Demanding Your Time

	06-08	0523, Bn CO	04, 0543	01-03	E7-E9	IN	AR	ADA	FA	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
Reg Abuse Control	2.9	2.7	2.2	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7	3.0	2.9
Community Relations	2.6	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.2
Police Relations	3.1	2.9	2.4	3.1	2.8	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.7	3.5	3.0
Small Unit Training	3.3	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.3	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.7
Command Inspections	2.7	2.8	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.5	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.8	3.2
Operational Sessions	4.6	3.7	4.1	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.8	4.1
Vehicle Maintenance	4.1	4.0	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.4	4.0	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.9	3.5
Administration	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.2	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6

[illegible]

statements describe various problem areas which may or may not apply. Please indicate, for each statement, how these areas apply to your current unit by circling a number for each statement in the column to the right, whether it is a "Grave Problem Area," "Major Problem Area," "Minor Problem Area," or "No Problem."

motivated junior officers
adequately perform their

trained rifleman (MOS11B)
of Vietnam, with an average
his retainability, and re-
him in a different MOS so
can go through required unit
tion program.

time. Too many nontactical
nts imposed on the unit.

of qualified NCOs. Have
.5 personnel but only a few
nd above. E-5 and E-6 types
ledge and experience that
.4's had a few years ago.

experienced administrative
l in the hard skill areas
of keeping abreast of the
administrative requirements.

turnover of personnel every
onths and the impact on training.

GRAVE
4

MAJOR
3

MINOR
2

NO PROBLEM
1

CONUS

EUROPE

OTHER

2.2 2.0 2.2 2.1 2.1 2.0 2.2

2.6 3.0 2.6 2.7 2.9 2.5 2.5

3.2 3.3 3.1 3.2 3.2 3.4 3.0

3.1 3.1 2.8 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1

2.7 2.6 2.6 2.7 2.6 2.7 2.7

3.2 3.4 3.0 3.3 3.3 3.2 3.2

2.3 2.0 2.1 2.0 2.4

2.6 2.7 2.7 2.7 2.7

2.6 3.0 3.3 3.3 3.0

3.0 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.0

3.1 2.9 2.8 2.6 2.6

3.1 3.6 3.4 3.3 3.0

The following statements describe various problem areas which may or may not apply to a unit. Please indicate, for each statement, how these areas apply to your current or previous unit by circling a number for each statement in the column to the right showing whether it is a "Grave Problem Area," "Major Problem Area," "Minor Problem Area," or "No Problem."

	GRAVE 4	MAJOR 3	MINOR 2	NO PROBLEM 1	CONUS
1. Lack of motivated junior officers willing to adequately perform their duties.	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.1
2. Taking a trained rifleman (MOS11B) just out of Vietnam, with an average of 6 months retainability, and re-training him in a different MOS so that he can go through required unit qualification program.	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
3. Training time. Too many nontactical requirements imposed on the unit.	3.2	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.2
4. Shortage of qualified NCOs. Have excess E-5 personnel but only a few are E-6 and above. E-5 and E-6 types have knowledge and experience that E-3 or E-4's had a few years ago.	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.8	3.1
5. Lack of experienced administrative personnel in the hard skill areas capable of keeping abreast of the daily administrative requirements.	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.6
6. Complete turnover of personnel every 7 or 8 months and the impact on training.	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.3	3.3

06-08	05-03, Bn CO	04, 05	01-03	H7-K9	GRAVE			MAJOR 3	MINOR			NO PROBLEM 1	CONUS	EUROPE	OTHER
					4	AD	FA		2	3	4				
2.5	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.0				2.9	3.0	2.7	2.8		3.0	2.8	2.6
3.1	2.5	2.8	2.8	3.3				2.9	2.9	3.3	2.9		2.9	3.0	3.0
2.4	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.5				2.4	2.2	2.5	2.3		2.2	2.5	2.5
2.5	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.6				2.6	2.7	2.7	2.6		2.7	2.8	2.6
2.1	1.7	1.9	1.8	2.4				2.0	1.9	2.2	2.0		2.1	1.8	2.0
2.1	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.6				2.3	2.3	2.6	2.3		2.3	2.3	2.4
2.1	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.3				2.3	2.3	2.6	2.4		2.4	2.4	2.3

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

amer" attitude of Viet Nam

ne. The need for stronger
ne in the new changing Army.

icers and NCOs are called to
duties well beyond the normal
ce level--for example--line
as commanded by lieutenants
as than 2 years service.

ining load made difficult by
priorities of higher head-

g how to adjust to a per-
society of free-thinking
lieutenants.

e problem caused by the fact
r draftee soldiers are serving
unpopular war and that they are
are of it.

g day-to-day training is
ed.

2

7. "Short-timer" attitude of Viet Nam returnees.

8. Discipline. The need for stronger discipline in the new changing Army.

9. The officers and NCOs are called to perform duties well beyond the normal experience level--for example--line companies commanded by lieutenants with less than 2 years service.

10. The training load made difficult by changing priorities of higher head-quarters.

11. Learning how to adjust to a permissive society of free-thinking young lieutenants.

12. A morale problem caused by the fact that our draftee soldiers are serving in an unpopular war and that they are well aware of it.

13. Insuring day-to-day training is conducted.

	GRAVE 4		MAJOR 3		MINOR 2		NO PROBLEM 1
	06-08	05-03, Bn CO	04, 05	01-03	R7-R9	EA ADA RA	
	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.0	2.9 3.0 2.7 2.8	3.
	3.1	2.5	2.0	2.8	3.3	2.9 2.9 3.3 2.9	2.
	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.4 2.2 2.5 2.3	2.
	2.5	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.6 2.7 2.7 2.6	2.
	2.1	1.7	1.9	1.8	2.4	2.0 1.9 2.2 2.0	2.
	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.6	2.3 2.3 2.6 2.3	2.
	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.3 2.3 2.6 2.4	2.

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER CR-D4-71-33✓	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) ANALYSIS OF TRAINING MANAGEMENT SURVEY		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Consulting Report
7. AUTHOR(s) T. O. Jacobs, J. A. Salter, C. I. Christie, and E. W. Spinaio		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER CR-D4-71-33
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) 300 North Washington Street Alexandria, Virginia 22314		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) DAHC 19-70-C-0012✓
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Department of the Army Office of the Chief of Research and Development Washington, D.C. 20310		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q062107A712
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE October 1971
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 73
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES This research was conducted by HumRRO Division No. 4, Fort Benning, Georgia, under Technical Advisory Services for the Board for Dynamic Training. The Supplement to this report is entitled, "Report of Reserve and National Guard Data."		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Training Management Survey Small-unit training		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The present report does not elaborate all the data actually contained in the survey results. An attempt has been made to restrict the discussion to those findings of greatest salience, from the point of view of identifying the problem and factors that bear on the problem. Overall, there is substantial confidence at all rank levels in the motivation and quality of small unit leaders and commanders. This suggests that there would be no universal support for the proposition that these leaders and commanders are basically		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

20. Continued...

lacking in ability. Also, there is substantial indications in the survey results that seniors and subordinates do not see eye-to-eye on many key points and expectations, many of which have to do with the present quality of small unit training, the possibility of improvement, and the ways in which improvement might be effected.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)